UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA * Case No. 04-CR-140(FB)

Brooklyn, New York April 27, 2006

11:47 a.m. V.

JOSUE CARRETO, et al.,

Defendants.

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE FREDERIC BLOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: MONICA E. RYAN, ESQ.

ANNE MILGRAM, ESQ.

United States Attorneys Office

147 Pierrepont Street Brooklyn, NY 11201

HILARY S. AXAM, ESQ. Department of Justice United States Government

For the Defendant,
Josue Flores Carreto: ROY R. KULCSAR, ESQ. 27 Union Square West

Suite 503

New York, NY 10003

MS. ANDRIJA DANDRIDGE ESR Operator:

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

> Fiore Transcription Service, Inc. **67Elaine Drive** Shelton, Connecticut 06484 (203)929-9992

For the Defendant, MICHAEL MUSA-OBREGON, ESQ. Gerardo Flores Carreto: Law Offices of S. Michael

Musa-Obregon

400 Madison Avenue

Suite 1101

New York, NY 10017

For the Defendant, CHARLES S. HOCHBAUM, ESQ. Daniel Perez Alonso: Charles S. Hochbaum, P.C.

44 Court Street, Suite 307

Brooklyn, NY 11201

Interpreter: MS. LIBIA CLANCY

(Proceedings commenced at 11:47 a.m.)

1.3

THE CLERK: Criminal cause for sentencing United

States of America vs. Josue Flores Carreto, Gerardo Flores

Carreto and Daniel Perez Alonso.

At this time, I ask the parties to state your appearances for the record.

MS. RYAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Monica Ryan for the United States, along with Anne Milgram, Special Assistant United States Attorney, and Hilary Axam, a trial attorney from the Department of Justice.

MS. MILGRAM: Good Morning, Your Honor.

MS. AXAM: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. KULCSAR: Good Morning, Your Honor, with profound apologies for being so late. Roy Kulcsar for Josue Flores Carreto.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, on behalf of Gerardo Flores Carreto, Michael Musa-Obregon.

MR. HOCHBAUM: For the defendant, Daniel Perez Alonso, Charles Hochbaum. Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning everybody.

You know, we're going to have a probably pretty lengthy proceeding here because we have three defendants and they're looking at substantial time and we have about six victims who want to also make comments, so that's going to

```
4
 1
        all take a good deal of time, let alone going through the
 2
        advisory guideline calculations.
 3
                  I think probably the best way to start will be to
 4
        hear from the victims. I guess we could do that in the first
        instance, unless anybody has any serious objection to that.
 5
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, Judge, I believe that the
 6
 7
        defense has some matters they would like to place on the
        record before we do that.
 8
 9
                  THE COURT: Well, that's one thing we can do also,
        but the victims do have the right to comment. So, they're
10
        going to be given a chance.
11
12
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I --
                  THE COURT: What's your preference, Ms. Ryan?
13
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I think we would prefer to
14
15
        wait. We've explained to the victims that it's their right
16
        to speak or not to speak and I think they may feel more
        comfortable after hearing what --
17
18
                  THE COURT: So --
19
                  MS. RYAN: -- some things that may be said in court
20
        today.
21
                  THE COURT: All right. Well, you know, I have the
22
        discretion to do it, you know, at the beginning, in the
23
        middle or at the end.
24
                  MS. RYAN: Of course, Judge.
25
                  THE COURT: So, and that's apparently Mr.
```

```
5
 1
        Hochbaum's preference as well, I take it, so we'll proceed
 2
        then with making our advisory quideline calculations in the
 3
        first instance and to talk, in the course of doing that,
        about all issues that need to be addressed. How is that?
 4
                  MS. RYAN: That's fine. Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
                  THE COURT: All right.
 6
 7
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, prior to going into the
 8
        advisory guidelines, it seems to me that there are some
 9
        issues that --
10
                  THE COURT: We have some motions will have to be
        disposed of.
11
12
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: That's correct, Judge.
1.3
                  THE COURT: Right.
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: With regard to that -- let me know
14
15
        when you're ready.
16
                  THE COURT: Pardon?
17
                  Is there any problem hearing me? I have the
18
        microphone on. Is there any problem hearing me?
19
                  MS. DANDRIDGE: That's okay.
20
                  THE COURT: Okay.
21
                  The microphones are on, since this is being taken
22
        by ESR, so we need the microphones. You don't have to get
23
        too close to them because if you do, there will be some
24
        feedback. My own preference is not to use the microphones
25
        for that reason, but when we have ESR, we have no choice in
```

Maybe one of my co-counsel can speak more

specifically towards this. He's actually read them and they're in Spanish.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, on behalf of Gerardo Carreto Flores. This morning I -- upon arriving in court, I met with an investigator that was hired by all three defendants collectively. That investigator is a gentleman by the name of Willie Acosta. Mr. Acosta was working for the defendants without the supervision of counsel and he went to Mexico over the last month.

He had contacted all three of the defense lawyers and indicated to us previously that there were -- there existed some transcripts from a proceeding in Mexico that contained exculpatory information with respect to the statements that were made by the -- three of the victims in the proceedings here that were also taken in Mexico.

We urged -- all three counsel urged the investigator that if these transcripts indeed existed to bring them to our attention and bring them to us immediately.

Last night I received a call at about 10:30 at night from the investigator where he called me generically, but did not mention that these transcripts existed until I directly asked him "Well, do you have these transcripts?" He said, "Yes."

I then made arrangements to -- for him to bring them to court this morning. Upon my arriving, I perused the

```
8
 1
        transcripts and it does appear -- they do appear to have
        sworn statements of fact by three of the victims in this case
 2
 3
        where they directly contradict their position before the
 4
        government --
 5
                  THE COURT: That was down in Mexico, you see.
                  MS. RYAN: Yes --
 6
 7
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: In Mexico.
 8
                  THE COURT: They probably --
 9
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, if I can --
                  THE COURT: They probably --
10
                  You don't have to --
11
12
                  MS. RYAN: Thank you.
13
                  THE COURT: -- they're probably scared to death
14
        when they did that.
15
                  Look aside from that, I do recall that your clients
16
        pled quilty, q-u-I-l-t-y. Right. And that happened back not
        too long ago. Well, it did happen a long time ago on April
17
18
        5th, 2005. And, boy, I read over the transcript of those
19
        proceedings very carefully. Not to pat myself on the back,
        you know, too hard because I don't want faint from the
20
21
        process. It's about the best plea allocution I ever took in
22
        my distinguished 11 plus years on the bench.
23
                  Why? Because I know that there's going to be a
24
        life subsequent to my sentence. Not that your clients don't
```

have the right to appeal, okay? But everything suggested to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
this wise Judge that I should, you know, use every
prophylactic lawful means at my disposal to minimize the
potential of 2255 collateral applications raising issues on
appeal and indeed, in raising issues before me today which
we'll discuss.
          So, when I read over the plea allocution, I said,
"Boy, Judge Block, you did a good job." Okay, but they all
pled guilty. So if they had all this information and they
knew what happened in Mexico, why pray tell did they plead
quilty?
          Do you have a good answer for that, Mr. Kulcsar?
          MR. KULCSAR: Your Honor, as I'm sure Your Honor
remembers, I was not counsel for Josue --
          THE COURT: Well, but I'm giving you an opportunity
to respond to that question, if you would like. Do you have
an answer to that first?
          MR. KULCSAR: Well, Your Honor --
          THE COURT: If not, then Mr. Musa-Obregon, do you
have an answer to that question?
```

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, Judge, I don't know if I have an answer to that. It's a complex --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- question, but I have a response and that is that being intimately familiar with the proceedings down -- before the pleas were taken, defense

counsel -- the position that Mr. Carreto would like me to advance at this point, and I'm doing this at his request, is that --

THE COURT: Well, you're doing the best job you can as his counsel. They're up against it. We understand that. Go ahead.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: He had us ask -- the defense lawyers ask the prosecutors whether the women were maintaining this position against the defendants with respect to the violence, with respect to the forced prostitution, et cetera, et cetera. And we specifically asked if there existed any types of indications that their position had been different.

THE COURT: It doesn't affect their guilty plea.

You think I should consider it on the issue of sentencing and shouldn't give any credibility to those three people? You know, is that what you're suggesting? They still pled guilty to all counts.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: In the alternative, I would suggest that, Judge. I think --

THE COURT: Okay. I'll take it under advisement.

Mr. Hochbaum, do you wish to say anything?

MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, my client feels that in light of the information, and it's obviously a problem for us that it came so untimely, that it raises significant issues. With

```
1
        regard to the quilty plea, my client's position was that --
 2
                  THE COURT: Okay.
 3
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- he did not get appropriate advice
        from his prior attorney, which is one of the reasons we wrote
 4
        a letter to you in January of '06 with regard to that
 5
        attorney and why I was subsequently retained.
 6
 7
                  So I have reviewed the transcript of the plea, but
 8
        I have not -- was not a party to the plea.
 9
                  THE COURT: Well, of course.
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: And my client's proposition is that
10
        this information changes dramatically the position of all
11
12
        parties with regard to the guilty plea and that he should be
        allowed the opportunity --
13
14
                  THE COURT: So, with that information, you would
15
        have counseled him to have gone forward with the trial. And
16
        you think that that's the counsel you would have given him at
        that time? If you were the lawyer, not Mr. Lashley?
17
18
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I think it's --
19
                  THE COURT: Is that what your position is?
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: My position is that it's likely that
20
21
        I would have entered into further negotiations --
22
                  THE COURT: I see.
23
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- and potentially advised him that
24
        these transcripts and the statements of the witnesses down
25
        there may have a -- might have had a significant impact on
```

```
12
        whether or not there would have been a determination --
 1
 2
                  THE COURT: Do you have --
 3
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- of guilt.
 4
                  THE COURT: -- any reason why they pled quilty? I
        mean we went through an elaborate proceeding. How many pages
 5
        is this?
 6
 7
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Well --
 8
                  THE COURT: Eighty-some-odd pages. Have you read
 9
        the transcript?
10
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I have read the transcript.
                  THE COURT: Pretty good, huh? You know Judge
11
12
        Block. You agree with me that's one of my better proceedings
        I've ever conducted in 11 plus years?
13
14
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, Judge, I tried cases --
15
                  THE COURT: I don't want you to make an admission -
16
17
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- in front of you.
18
                  THE COURT: -- against interest. You realize --
19
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I certainly agree with the Court
20
        that the Court covered those important issues that are --
21
                  THE COURT: Is there anything I did not cover? I
22
        mean, you know, I pride myself in doing a good job.
23
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, it appears according to the
24
        defendants that there was some question as to whether or not
25
        the Court advised the defendant with regard to his right to
```

```
13
 1
        testify during the trial. I did not see that --
 2
                  THE COURT: Right.
 3
                  Well, did you read --
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- in the transcript.
 4
                  THE COURT: You read the transcript.
 5
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I did, Judge.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Do you agree with that assessment?
        you think Judge Block did advise him of his right to testify?
 8
 9
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I believe that the defendant's
        constitutional rights were adequately advised under the
10
        standards set forth, Judge. However --
11
12
                  THE COURT: So on page 45 of the transcript, the
13
        Court said, "At the trial, while you would have the right to
14
        testify if you wish to do so, you could not be required to
15
        testify." Then we explained his Fifth Amendment right. So,
16
        maybe your client is in error about that, but people make
        mistakes.
17
18
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: That may be true, Judge, but it
19
        seems to me that --
20
                  THE COURT: Ms. Ryan can't wait to talk. She
21
        doesn't think I'm doing --
22
                  MS. RYAN: Your right, Judge.
23
                  THE COURT: -- an adequate job. But you're doing a
24
        good job for your clients. I understand all that, but their
25
        -- they accepted responsibility. They pled before the Court.
```

```
14
 1
        Anything else you wish to say about your motions?
 2
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor --
                  THE COURT: Let's go on. Let's move it along.
 3
 4
        They're kind of silly. Let's go on.
 5
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: With the expectation that Your
        Honor will deny this request, I would, at this point --
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Right.
 8
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- request the opportunity to
 9
        review these transcripts and --
10
                  THE COURT: You can do whatever you want to do.
        Your motion is silly. It's going to be denied.
11
12
                  Ms. Ryan, go ahead.
1.3
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I just wanted to put one
14
        fact on the record. I think --
15
                  THE COURT: Just make a record here. We're making
16
        a record. It's going to be reviewed by other authorities.
17
                  MS. RYAN: Exactly.
18
                  THE COURT: The motion's going to be denied. What
19
        do you want to say?
20
                  MS. RYAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Obviously, the
21
        government's in complete agreement with Court about the --
22
                  THE COURT: Do you wish to add anything?
23
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
24
                  THE COURT: To these claims here of this sudden
25
        appearances of some other statements arguably in Mexico.
```

```
15
 1
                  MS. RYAN: I have a few points. First, the
 2
        government hasn't seen any of these materials.
 3
                  THE COURT: Right.
 4
                  MS. RYAN: But, I do have some expectations about
        what they might contain, only because everyone in this
 5
        courtroom knows that both the defendants and the victims have
 6
 7
        all been in this country at least since January of 2004 when
        they were all arrested by Immigration and Customs
 8
 9
        Enforcement.
10
                  THE COURT: By the way, do you have any of these
        so-called documents?
11
12
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, Judge. They --
1.3
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Transcripts we have --
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: They were provided --
14
15
                  THE COURT: Okay.
16
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- to us and they look
        authentic.
17
18
                  THE COURT: You haven't given them to the
19
        government though, have you?
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, I just received them --
20
21
                  THE COURT: Just received.
22
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- moments before coming into
23
        court.
24
                  THE COURT: Moments before the sentencing.
25
                  What else, Ms. Ryan?
```

1 MR. KULCSAR: They're in Spanish apparently also, 2 Your Honor, obviously. 3 THE COURT: Moments before the sentence you had --4 this --5 MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your --THE COURT: -- plea was taken a year ago and just 6 7 on the eve of sentence, these things appear, but it doesn't 8 affect the fact that they pled guilty. 9 Go ahead, Ms. Ryan. MS. RYAN: Exactly, Your Honor, and I'd like to 10 point out that I think even if these documents contain 11 12 anything that the defendants might deem helpful, it's legally irrelevant to this case. The defendants pled quilty to 13 smuggling these young women into the United States and 14 15 forcing them into prostitution in New York --16 THE COURT: They did plead guilty to those things, right? --17 18 MS. RYAN: Clearly after they had left Mexico. 19 obviously as the Court's already recognized the government's 20 position that whatever statements may have been made by any 21 of these victims in Mexico were done at the coerced efforts 22 of the defendants. 23 THE COURT: All right, now, in terms of processing 24 the matter because, you know, we have to be very careful 25 because the defendants are going to go to jail for a long

time in all probability, though I haven't made that determination yet, we can anticipate that this will be furthered -- this proceeding will have another chapter to it, so to speak, and that may be on the Court of Appeals. So, we want to make a very good record. A very clear record.

Maybe we should give the defense an opportunity to produce these documents. We can mark them at this particular time and we can at least have them as part of this proceeding.

What do you think of that idea, Ms. Ryan?

MS. RYAN: Yes, we --

THE COURT: If we have them, but they should at least be able to present them to the Court.

MR. HOCHBAUM: The problem, Judge, is that they're in Spanish.

THE COURT: Well, I can only -- I can't do more than that.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, it seems to me that --

THE COURT: Do you want to have them submitted, Mr. Hochbaum, to the Court and have them marked at this time so that they can be officially part of this proceeding? Yes or no.

MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I think it's more appropriate for these kind of materials to be attached to a 2255 motion by these defendants. This is the day of

```
1
        sentencing and this is the first time this material's come
 2
        forward.
 3
                  THE COURT: We can have them identified now.
 4
        That's okay, if you want to do that --
                  MS. RYAN: And we have no guarantees as to any of
 5
        its authenticity either.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Of course not. I just want to know
 8
        whether -- since they're being referred to, the Court's, you
 9
        know, preference is to have, you know, everything that's
10
        referred to before the Court. I'm not saying what
        significance to be attached to it, but since it's been
11
        referred to, like the best evidence rule, you know.
12
                  You want to have them marked now?
1.3
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: No, Judge, what I want is a
14
15
        government --
16
                  THE COURT: All right, I'm giving you the choice --
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, may I just --
17
18
                  THE COURT: Yes.
19
                  Would you like to have them marked, Mr. Obregon?
20
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: No, Judge, what I want --
21
                  THE COURT: Just one second. I'm conducting the
22
        proceeding. I'm just asking each of you if you like to have
23
        them marked so we have them officially as part of these
24
        proceedings.
25
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, may I confer with
```

```
co-counsel?
```

1.3

THE COURT: Mr. Kulcsar, would you like to have them marked?

MR. KULCSAR: Well, I've been trying to address the Court with respect to a different aspect that I think the Court has to consider. I think they --

THE COURT: Just answer my question whether you would like to have them marked?

MR. KULCSAR: I think they should be made available to the Court or to an official court interpreter, so that the Court can determine exactly the significance because leaving aside the issue of withdrawing the plea --

THE COURT: Stop.

Do you have these papers in court today?

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Produce them to the court's clerk and they'll be marked.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I'm handing over to the court's clerk documents received from Investigator Acosta this morning; book 1, part 1 in a burgundy binder and book 1, part 2. They apparently have been -- sections have been highlighted, the stick-ons, with respect to relevant testimony in this case.

THE COURT: Good. So they're marked now and we have these documents identified. Okay, so the clerk of the

```
1
        court will mark this as a court exhibit at this time.
             (Court Exhibit A marked for identification.)
 2
 3
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, it is our request, however,
 4
        that in light of production of this material and the nature
        of it, that being in Spanish, that the Court consider a joint
 5
        request by counsel to adjourn the sentence --
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: All right.
 8
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- to allow us to provide
 9
        interpreted copies --
                  THE COURT: All right. I understand your request.
10
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- to the Court --
11
                  THE COURT: You made them request on behalf of your
12
        client. It's denied. We're going to go forward with this
13
14
        sentencing.
15
                  Let me just dispose of the motion for the
16
        withdrawal of the plea that's before me. That's denied as
17
        well.
18
                  Just to go back to this last minute, you know,
19
        Spanish, you know, document or set of papers, the reason for
        the denial of any application for adjournment is that it's at
20
21
        the eve of trial, the plea allocution was taken back on April
22
        5th, 2005, over a year ago, the record is replete with the
23
        Court's indulgence for a number of adjournments at the behest
24
        of defense counsel and the time has come now for sentencing.
25
        These last minute types of things just are counterintuitive
```

in terms of going forward.

But be that as it may, in the face of the clear pleas of guilty rendered by each defendant, even if they have statements in Mexico from some of these victims, it doesn't really countermand the fact that they each stood before Judge Block and pleaded guilty to all these crimes, and that's what really dominates.

And you can make comments about this in respect to sentencing. I'll listen to you. If you want to make whatever comments you want as a result of these documents, fine. The Court has marked this as an exhibit and we'll proceed.

Now, as far as the withdrawal of the plea, of course the Court was very concerned about whether counsel was acceptable to the defendants and in particular in respect to Mr. Lashley, there was a long history about that.

And, you know, right at the outset of the proceedings back on April 5th, 2005, when the pleas were taken, I painstakingly explored whether there's any problem that any of the defendants had with their counsel and in particular with Mr. Lashley. And I called specific attention to Mr. Lashley's situation.

There were applications that were filed in the Court of Appeals to seek withdrawal of counsel and substitution of counsel. We carefully made sure that each of

the defendants were satisfied with their legal representation. It was agreed to withdraw their application to the Court of Appeals because they were happy with legal representation.

I'm not going to read to you chapter, book and verse, but I've gone over the minutes and I can't think of how I could have done it more poignantly or more effectively than what I did when we explored whether or not there was any problems with counsel.

Now, having said that preliminarily in terms of the withdrawal of the guilty plea, I just call your attention to some specific parts of the transcript and I'll read them verbatim. On page 47, I expressly told all the defendants:

"I want you to understand that when you give
me that guilty plea you cannot count on withdrawing
your guilty plea once you give it to me. You will
be giving me your guilty plea with the
understanding that it will stick. That you will
not later on be able to withdraw your plea. It I
very important that you understand that."

And I asked each one in turn whether there was any problem with that and they each said no. Then I said they each recognize that they understand that.

Then I went on to say:

"Now if I sentence you contrary to the law --

in other words, if I do something that I should not be doing, namely giving an incorrect or unlawful sentence, certainly you would have the right to appeal because I should not sentence you, nor do I intend to contrary to the law.

But even in that case, while you would have the right to have an unlawful sentence corrected by appealing to a higher authority, still you would not be able to withdraw your guilty plea once you give it to me. Only to make sure you have a legal sentence rendered."

Then I asked each defendant in turn whether there was any problem with that, whether everybody understood that and they all said yes. And then we went on with the rest of the proceedings.

At the end of the part of the proceedings where I advised everybody of their rights, I asked whether or not they understood about all their rights and that they understood that nobody has made any promises to you. I asked specifically whether anyone threatened or forced the defendant to plead guilty or made any promise to induce the defendant to plea guilty. We covered that very carefully.

And there's one other part which I want to refer to also. Yes. After I had finished advising them of their rights and the fact that we have the *Pimentel* letter and

1.3

there were estimates made, I told them again "It is important for you to understand again" -- this is at page 64 of the transcript -- "that whatever sentence I render, you will not be able to withdraw your guilty plea once you give it to me." So this is the third time you see I'm counseling the defendant's about that.

The reason why I am taking the time to go through this is because I think it's important for me to make a proper record in the face of their application to withdraw their guilty plea. And yes, I think it's important that we all recall these events.

Then I went on to say:

"It is important for you to understand that
the government has put forward their estimate. The
estimate of what the sentencing could turn out to
be, but I'm not bound by that. I may agree or
disagree. I will make my own independent
assessment. It may well be that the sentence may
exceed the government's estimate or it may well be
it is less than the government's estimate."
I said also:

"I cannot tell you at this particular time, but it is important for you to understand that that estimate is not chiseled in stone. That I, the Judge, am responsible for making your sentence and

"No question, Your Honor. We are ready to proceed."

Now, I just want to add also that at the onset of the proceedings, I inquired of the defendants as to why is it that at the eleventh hour when the jurors were here ready to be voir dired that they were having a change of heart at the eleventh hour. And I said that it may well be that you will do no worse if you plead to the entire indictment than you would if you did go forward to trial. And I was concerned about that. And the lawyers assured me that this was what their clients preferred.

They spoke about the fact that they would arguably be entitled possibly to acceptance of responsibility and that they felt that by pleading, they would be in a better position come sentencing rather than to run the risk of apparently facing certain conviction on all of these charges or most of these charges as evidenced by their guilty pleas and the strong evidence apparently that the government had at its disposal.

So they made a reasoned decision to take these pleas after I inquired about all of that.

And so I think having said all of that, Mr. Kulcsar, do you have a hard time hearing me? I have the microphone on. You seem to be bending forward.

MR. KULCSAR: I appreciate that.

```
27
 1
                  THE COURT: Do you wish me to speak a little
 2
        louder?
 3
                  MR. KULCSAR: Thank you.
                  THE COURT: I'll try --
 4
 5
                  MR. KULCSAR: That would be great. Thank you.
                  THE COURT: -- because you have some --
 6
 7
                  MR. KULCSAR: I know, Your Honor.
 8
                  THE COURT: -- hearing problems --
 9
                  MR. KULCSAR: Thanks, Your Honor.
                  THE COURT: -- and I have a low voice.
10
                  MR. KULCSAR: I know that, Your Honor.
11
12
                  THE COURT: So the combination of some hearing loss
13
        and a low voice by the Judge is not a good tandem.
                  MR. KULCSAR: Thank you.
14
15
                  THE COURT: All right? I'll try to speak louder.
16
                  So all of what I just said sets the stage for
        telling you and explaining to you why these motions now at
17
18
        the eleventh hour to withdraw the quilty plea are denied.
19
             And, you know, separate apart from the fact that I so
20
        painstakingly alerted all of the defendants the fact that I
21
        will not allow them to withdraw the guilty plea, the -- and
22
        they knew about that, to make the application on the eve of
23
        sentence, you know, adds further fuel to the fire and further
24
        warrants the Court denying the motions.
25
                  So the record is clear about that, so all motions
```

```
Case 1:04-cr-00140-FB Document 199 Filed 12/13/11 Page 28 of 198 PageID #: 788
                                                                     28
 1
        are denied.
 2
                  If there are any other motions out there, I don't
 3
        know of any, but they should be deemed denied as well.
 4
                  Are there anything -- anything else out there, Mr.
        Kulcsar?
 5
                  MR. KULCSAR: Your Honor --
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Any other motion?
 8
                  MR. KULCSAR: -- I think --
 9
                  THE COURT: Any other motions?
                  MR. KULCSAR: Yes, I'm addressing Your Honor's --
10
                  THE COURT: Ask me --
11
                  MR. KULCSAR: -- review of the transcript.
12
                  THE COURT: I'm giving you an opportunity to tell
13
        me whether there are any other motions. You don't have to
14
15
        debate with me about my review of the record. It's not what
16
        I'm asking you to do. Are there any other motions by your
        client? Yes or no.
17
18
                  MR. KULCSAR: You determined that whatever the
19
        application was for an adjournment.
                  THE COURT: Pardon?
20
21
                  MR. KULCSAR: That you --
22
                  THE COURT: That's been denied.
23
                  MR. KULCSAR: That's foreclosed.
24
                  THE COURT: Mr. Obregon?
```

MR. KULCSAR: I was just going to add one aspect to

the transcript. Since I wasn't here, I did read it. And I thought in might be pertinent, but if Your Honor has already determined that issue, then I'll move on to --

THE COURT: I just want to know if there's any other motions.

MR. KULCSAR: Well, I think there's another application with respect to the sentencing issue.

THE COURT: We're not at sentencing. I'm just dealing with motions here before we proceed to sentencing.

MR. KULCSAR: Well, the other aspect to the motion for postponement relates to this: Your Honor at the time of taking the plea, also asked the defense counsel whether they were aware of any valid defenses that existed at the time of taking the plea and I believe counsel in good faith answered no.

I also note in speaking to Mr. Del Valle in reviewing some of the discovery, there was a type of *Brady* letter sent out by the government that made reference to Mexico and in point of fact, definitively stated that the only evidence of an exculpatory -- and I use that word broadly -- nature was apparently a --

THE COURT: Do you have any other motions? You can talk all you want to. I'm not going to allow you to do that of course, but I'm asking you very specifically so we have a nice clean record for higher authorities to review.

```
1
                  Do you or do you not have any other motions before
 2
        we proceed to sentencing --
 3
                  MR. KULCSAR: No.
 4
                  THE COURT: -- at this time? All right.
                  Mr. Obregon, how about you?
 5
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, Your Honor.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: And Mr. Hochbaum?
 8
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: No, Judge. I have a request,
 9
        however, that we might do this from the table. I can sit
        with my client.
10
                  THE COURT: You have a hard time standing?
11
12
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I don't --
1.3
                  THE COURT: You can pull up a chair. You can sit
        if you like. Any problems?
14
15
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: No, just in terms of the length of
16
        the anticipated procedure here, Judge, just thought it might
17
        be better if all counsel were able to work from the table.
18
                  THE COURT: I like to have you close by here
19
        because we have to record you by these microphones. But if
        you need to sit because you're, you know, feeling like Barry
20
21
        Bonds these days, by all means I'll accommodate that.
22
                  Anybody else wish to sit in front of me? All
23
        right.
24
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Okay.
                  THE COURT: Feel free to do so if at any time you
25
```

```
31
 1
        need that type of comfort.
 2
                  Now, having cleared these motions and having denied
 3
        your request for adjournments, is there any other reason why
        we should not proceed to sentencing at this time?
 4
                  MR. KULCSAR: No, Your Honor.
 5
                  THE COURT: Mr. Kulcsar, none?
 6
 7
                  None? None? Okay.
 8
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: No, Your Honor.
 9
                  THE COURT: We understand all your rights are being
        protected and --
10
                  MR. KULCSAR: Your Honor, I --
11
12
                  THE COURT: -- carefully done. So now we'll
        proceed first with --
13
14
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: However, Judge, I would like the
15
        opportunity, I mean since I'm not standing by my client, to
16
        find out if there's some other issue he wants me to address,
        which is why I wanted to do this from the table, but --
17
18
                  THE COURT: Well, you know, we -- you want to have
19
        an opportunity to consult with your client now? I'll give
20
        you a brief opportunity, each of you, before we proceed.
21
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Thank you, Judge.
22
                  THE COURT: I'm going to work under the assumption
23
        that we're ready to proceed with sentencing, but if you want
24
        a brief moment to talk to your client, go ahead.
25
             (Pause/counsel conferring.)
```

```
1
                  MR. KULCSAR: The question is whether we're ready
 2
        to proceed with sentencing. I would request we not proceed
 3
        with sentencing because --
 4
                  THE COURT: You made that request.
                  MR. KULCSAR: And the reason simply stated is this:
 5
        Whatever value that material has or doesn't have with respect
 6
 7
        to a motion to withdraw a plea or anything else --
 8
                  THE COURT: Right.
 9
                  MR. KULCSAR: -- it does have certain significance
        with respect to the calculations that are in the PSR.
10
        example --
11
12
                  THE COURT: You can address those issues during the
13
        course of the sentencing.
14
                  MR. KULCSAR: Well, I can't because I'm not fully
15
        cognizant of what's in the transcript and I --
16
                  THE COURT: It's not my fault.
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: It's not defense counsel's fault
17
18
        either, Judge.
19
                  THE COURT: You just can't come here, you know,
20
        when we're ready to start sentence and present me with a
21
        whole document of Spanish material and ask for an
        adjournment. Look we've discussed it. It's denied.
22
23
        circuit court's not going to change it. You're making your
24
        record. Let's go forward.
25
                  MR. KULCSAR: I do have three photographs that I
```

```
1
        would ask to be marked --
 2
                  THE COURT: Well, why don't you wait until we go
 3
        forward with sentencing --
 4
                  MR. KULCSAR: Okay.
                  THE COURT: -- and then you'll have an opportunity
 5
        to do that. Are you court assigned, Mr. Kulcsar?
 6
 7
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, he's --
 8
                  THE COURT: Court appointed or are you paying
 9
        counsel?
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- he's private, Your Honor.
10
                  THE COURT: You're private. Yes, because, you
11
12
        know, court assigned counsel usually knows the procedure and
        sometimes private counsel is not as knowledgeable about how
13
14
        the Court proceeds to handles sentences. So you listen
15
        carefully, okay? You'll be educated.
16
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, to the extent that
        Mr. Kulcsar's motion was made and denied by the Court, I will
17
18
        join in the application --
19
                  THE COURT: Everybody joins in everything. We
20
        understand that. We're here to painstakingly protect your
21
        rights. This is one of my job responsibilities.
22
             (Recess 12:22 p.m. to 12:23 p.m.)
23
                  THE COURT: Let's return now and proceed with
24
        sentencing.
25
             (Pause/counsel conferring.)
```

```
1
                  THE COURT: Mr. Hochbaum, I think you've had ample
 2
        opportunity. Let's go forward.
 3
             (Pause/counsel conferring.)
                  THE COURT: Mr. Hochbaum, come on up here. I'm
 4
        telling you to come up here now. Come on, right now. We're
 5
        not going to stay here all day. Under the circumstances,
 6
 7
        it's not indicated. Let's go.
 8
                  THE CLERK: Counsel.
 9
                  THE COURT: Mr. Hochbaum, I'm ordering you to come
10
        up here.
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I'm in the midst of a conversation,
11
12
        Judge.
                  THE COURT: I'm ordering you to come up here.
13
             (Pause.)
14
15
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I apologize, Judge. It would have
16
        been easier without, you know, but I tried to get this --
17
                  THE COURT: Mr. Hochbaum, I'm trying to protect
18
        your client's rights here, but we can't stay here all day.
19
        There's a long history here. You've had ample opportunity to
        have many discussions with your client since you took over
20
21
        for Mr. Lashley. If you want to say one thing further on the
22
        record now, you can do so. Let's go forward with the
23
        sentence.
24
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I would like to say one thing on the
25
        record, Judge. The discussion I was having with my client
```

```
1
        was not a discussion that was possible at an earlier time.
        It related to the Court's determination of the motions and
 2
 3
        the requests for adjournment, so --
                  THE COURT: I denied that.
 4
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand that, Judge, so I
 5
        needed to talk with him about what position he wanted me to
 6
 7
        take --
 8
                  THE COURT: Okay.
 9
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- during the sentencing process in
        light of those decisions rendered by the Court in the last --
10
                  THE COURT: Good.
11
12
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- 10 minutes, so --
                  THE COURT: You've had an opportunity, in my
1.3
        opinion, to have a chance to talk to him about it. Under the
14
15
        circumstances, we're ready to proceed.
16
                  All right, now let's take --
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, most respectfully, I would
17
18
        accept --
19
                  THE COURT: You can accept.
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- that determination and let the
20
21
        record reflect I need an additional five minutes with my
22
        client. If the Court doesn't want to give that to me, that's
23
        fine
24
                  THE COURT: Well, we'll take a break before we get
25
        to your client because it's 12:30 and I want to get through
```

```
1
        with one of these sentences first. And so, at the break,
 2
        you'll be able to further talk with your client.
 3
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Very good.
                  THE COURT: How's that? Okay?
 4
                  Now let's take Gerardo Flores Carreto.
 5
                  Mr. Musa-Obregon --
 6
 7
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
                  THE COURT: -- you're retained counsel?
 9
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, I am.
                  THE COURT: But you're very familiar with how to
10
        proceed with federal sentencing, aren't you?
11
12
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes.
1.3
                  THE COURT: All right, so I'm going to take you
        first since Mr. Kulcsar is not as familiar and he can perhaps
14
15
        benefit by the process that's about to unfold, so when his
16
        turn comes, you know, he can really be up to speed. Okay?
17
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor, I believe Mr.
        Kulcsar is more familiar with this than I am.
18
19
                  THE COURT: Really? Well, we'll go forward with
20
        Gerardo Flores Carreto first. Okay?
21
                  Now, what we'll do is we'll identify for the record
22
        what I have in the sentencing file. That's the first thing.
23
                  And let me first ask you, Mr. Musa-Obregon, even
24
        though you're not as familiar with these matters as Mr.
25
        Kulcsar, whether you nonetheless realize that you should go
```

```
1
        over the presentence report carefully with your client before
 2
        sentence?
 3
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, Judge.
 4
                  THE COURT: And I assume as a good lawyer, you've
        done that?
 5
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: So tell the Court since your client is
 8
        a Spanish speaking gentleman, how you communicated this
 9
        lengthy presentence report that's in English to him.
10
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, I speak Spanish. I
        went over it with him during the last proceeding. And he's
11
12
        highlighted certain portions of it for me that he contests.
        I believe he has a complete understanding of the sentencing
13
        PSR report as conveyed to him by me.
14
15
                  THE COURT: There's no question in your mind and
16
        since you're a Spanish speaking gentleman, you're perfectly
        satisfied that you've communicated every relevant aspect of
17
18
        the presentence report to your client?
19
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, I am.
20
                  THE COURT: All right, and you're satisfied that he
21
        understood what you were telling him?
22
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes.
23
                  THE COURT: There's no question in your mind that
24
        we can proceed in that regard, is there?
25
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No.
```

```
1
                  THE COURT: All right. Very good. So the
 2
        presentence report is dated January 27th, 2005. Now, in
 3
        addition, we have the recommendation of the Probation
 4
        Department and it's the Court's policy to make these
        sentencing recommendations available to counsel. Has that
 5
        been done here?
 6
 7
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes. Yes, it has.
 8
                  THE COURT: Have you folks had ample opportunity to
 9
        review the recommendation of the Probation Department?
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, I have.
10
                  THE COURT: All right. And I'm going to take a
11
12
        moment to read it into the record, even though it is part of
        the sentencing proceeding. Given the nature and the
13
        importance of this particular proceeding and the public
14
15
        interest in it, I think it's probably a good idea for me just
16
        to take a moment to read what the Probation Department says.
17
                  First of all, the Probation Department recommends
18
        on counts 2 through 6, 35 years of incarceration --
19
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, may I know what page
20
        you're reading from?
21
                  THE COURT: I'm reading the presentence
22
        recommendation from the Probation Department.
23
                  To run concurrent. I won't mention the five years
24
        -- the release provisions. And on counts 1 and 7 through 27,
25
        five years to run concurrent. So, in effect, Probation
```

recommends 35 years of incarceration. Okay?

1.3

And here is the comment that goes along with it:

"The defendant is a lifelong resident of

Mexico with limited ties to this country. He only

came to the United States several months prior to

his arrest and it appears that he only did so to

further this conspiracy. He has two children who

are the product of two prior relationships. One of

the mothers of the children was a victim of the

instant offense."

I'm not telling you to comment, you know, just want to explain what they're saying. You'll have ample opportunity to comment when I give you the opportunity to speak in the course of sentencing.

Continuing with the recommendation:

"The instant offense represents the defendant's first arrest and conviction. In this case, the defendant and his cohorts forced numerous women into prostitution. These women were held against their will through threats of death and/or violence against them or their families, raped by the defendants, beaten, not allowed contact with their family members and forced to commit acts of prostitution.

"The defendants targeted young, poor,

uneducated women from impoverished areas of Mexico and kept all of the women's earnings from the prostitution. The defendant's role in this offense was that of a leader. He recruited women, collected the money they earned, organized all aspects of the offense, used fraud, force and coercion to control the victims and gave orders to the women and other defendants in this offense.

"The victims in this case have suffered immensely. The defendants controlled every aspect of their lives. The women were searched for money as they were not allowed to keep any of that which they earned. Some were required to service more than 20 customers a day, then beaten when they did not earn enough money and repeatedly threatened with death.

"In addition to the rapes, one victim was forced to have an abortion when she became pregnant as a result of a rape by one of the defendants.

"The crimes against these women are horrific and inhumane. Further, the advisory guideline range, although high, does not take into consideration all of the victims in this case. The nature and seriousness of the offense, coupled with the aggravating factors of the number of victims

not considered in the advisory guidelines, as well as the history and characteristics of the defendant and the need for punishment and deterrence, call for a sentence of 35 years custody."

All right. Now, I'm not saying I agree with all of that or any particular part. I'm just reading it for informational purposes as part of the information that is in my sentencing file.

In addition, I have, in no necessary order, a letter dated April 24th, collectively from Daniel Alonso, the defendants Alonso and Josue Flores and Gerardo Flores, and that asks for all the type of requests that we've already processed here in this proceeding. They want to withdraw their plea, they're talking about not being happy with their lawyers and other factual matters that they take some issue with. I'm just identifying that letter at this time.

I have Mr. Musa-Obregon's letter of April 21, 2006, submitting a number of objections to the presentence investigative report. And I have reviewed that.

And, you know, it talks about the fact that there's reference in the PSR at paragraph 59 to over 50 women being coerced into prostitution. You can speak about that at the proper time. It talks about the government's estimate of over hundreds of thousands of dollars and objects to the introduction of victim impact statements.

And then I have the underlying sentencing sheet, so-called *Pimentel* letter, and of course the transcript of the proceedings of April 5th, 2005, which I will deem to be included in this particular sentence, as well as in respect to the sentences with the other two defendants as well.

Is there anything else I should have? There is a letter from the government.

MS. RYAN:: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that's one letter that, if memory serves me correctly, is dated April 26th, 2006.

MS. RYAN: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right, and that is a letter that the government submitted in respect to each of the defendants, so that letter will be deemed to be incorporated in each of the sentences.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: And it addresses the concerns of each defendant. Okay.

Anything else I should have before we make our advisory guidelines calculation, Mr. Musa-Obregon?

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's try to do that. Now, of course, they are extensive, but I think we can probably find a realistic way of dealing with them without having a three-day proceeding. Let's see whether we can do that.

And then I'll give you an opportunity to speak in support of the letter that you submitted to me and we can talk about that. But for purposes of making the guideline calculations, we want to turn to page 32. And --

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, I'm going to correct myself with the Court's permission. I'm going to ask that the transcripts that have been marked be also something that be considered by the Court.

THE COURT: Which transcripts? You mean the Spanish documents?

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, that Court Exhibit A and, you know, certainly you can speak to them in the course of sentencing. I'll give you the opportunity to do that, but I'm not going to delay the proceedings because of that. I've spoken about that.

I'm not going to give them the opportunity to withdraw their guilty plea because of that. We're clear about that. But I will give you the opportunity to refer to that. Since you're Spanish speaking, you probably, you know, a little bit what's contained in that set of papers, okay?

All right, so now let's use count 1 as a jumping off point. Because much of this is going to be repeated throughout all the counts. And we have here a base offense level in respect to count 1 of 27. Now, count 1 deals with

act A and counts 2 and counts 11 collectively deal with conspiracy to engage in sex trafficking, sex trafficking with Jane Doe 1 and transportation for purposes of prostitution.

Now we know that when we go through the calculations they are basically the same with just a few variations and the reason why they're so extensive is because we have eight victims.

So, we have to go through each of these in respect to each one because each victim is separate and apart and they're not all grouped together. Of course there is appropriate grouping within the confines of these calculations, but we have to deal with each victim separately.

So, here we have base offense level of 27. And in respect to Jane Doe Number 1, there's a four level enhancement for the use of physical force and threats of serious bodily injury. And then there's a two level enhancement because the victim was a vulnerable victim. And there's a four level enhancement because the defendant is deemed to be an organizer. And that results in an adjusted offense level of 37.

Now, there are may 37's, but since the issue of vulnerable victim repeats throughout, of physical force and organizer, if you wish to speak about any of these adjustments at this time, I'll give you the opportunity to do

```
45
 1
        so and then maybe we can cut to the chase when it comes to
 2
        the others, okay?
 3
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, Judge. Understanding that
 4
        Mr. Carreto's plea to the indictment included elements of him
        pleading guilty to using force in the course of promoting --
 5
                  THE COURT: Yes.
 6
 7
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- prostitution and the
        allocution even included elements of -- related to the victim
 8
 9
        related adjustment as to these women being from poor rural
        areas and he also acknowledged that he was a leader or a
10
11
        manager --
12
                  THE COURT: No, not a manager, you know, he's the
13
        leader. He's an organizer.
14
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I'm sorry, an organizer.
15
                  THE COURT: That's four levels. The leader is
16
        three levels.
17
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Right. Notwithstanding that --
18
                  THE COURT: He did allocute
19
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- those acknowledgments --
20
                  THE COURT: -- to all of this.
2.1
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- on behalf -- yes.
22
                  THE COURT: Right.
23
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Notwithstanding those
24
        acknowledgments as to all of those factors, there are
25
        elements of this case that I'd like the Court to consider.
```

THE COURT: Certainly, I'll give you the opportunity, but I just want to make our advisory guideline calculations first. And I do agree with you, of course, that he has allocuted to this very carefully and very specifically and there's no reason for me not to accept that the adjusted offense level of 37 in respect to count 1 is correct. And I don't hear any real serious disagreement from you.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, with the -- I have made an objection to the victim related adjustment and that is that I don't believe that this broad categorization of young, poor and uneducated women from rural areas of Mexico is sufficient to meet the type of standard that would require -- that would be subject -- I mean that would mean any crime against half the population of Mexico would be subject to an upward enhancement.

THE COURT: Well, I think that these particular victims are in a unique position. Ms. Ryan may wish to elaborate on that at this time.

MS. RYAN: Well, Your Honor, I -- we attempted to address Mr. Obregon's objection in our letter. On pages 5 and 6 of our letter, specifically.

THE COURT: You say that they're wealthy, they lived in good homes, they had cars, but I don't have any of that in the presentence report. That's just your letter.

MS. RYAN: That may not be entirely correct, Judge.

We certainly indicated that in our trial brief before the Court and be that as it may, the defendants were rich and powerful because they were operating this criminal organization for some time.

THE COURT: The nature of the fact that they are organizers and controlling this whole operation certainly shows that they were not in the same situation as the victims. I mean I think it's kind of silly to even, you know, go further in that respect.

And, you know, based upon their allocutions, if I recall correctly the total circumstances of this particular prosecution, there's no question that they represent the — these poor women, the very textbook example of vulnerable victims, and it is certainly sufficient throughout the proceedings here without me having to go back and cite chapter, book and verse for me to feel totally comfortable that we're dealing with prototypical vulnerable victims.

Okay, you made your record. So the adjusted offense level is 37.

Now having said that, now we then proceed to also agree, without having to be unnecessarily repetitious, that the adjusted offense level for count 1, act B et cetera is also 37? And --

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor, with my same -- noting my same objection --

MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor. She was 14 when she

25

```
1
        was first --
 2
                  THE COURT: What evidence do I have of that?
 3
                  MS. RYAN: I believe that that's indicated in the
 4
        presentence report.
                  THE COURT: It is in the presentence report.
 5
                  Do you take any exception to her age?
 6
 7
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, I discussed it with
 8
        my client and he does not believe that she was 14.
 9
                  THE COURT: Do we have a way of establishing that
        factually?
10
                  If we don't have anything that establishes it
11
12
        factually, then I'm going to just treat this as 37 also. My
        quess it's not going to make any difference, but I do see
1.3
14
        that the defendant has rights and if the defendant says that
15
        he doesn't believe she's 14, I need something to satisfy the
16
        Court that she was.
17
                  MS. RYAN: I understand the Court and I agree with
18
        what you've just stated, Your Honor. I would just note for
19
        the record that the Court gave these defendants ample
        opportunity to make these kinds of factual objections before
20
21
        we actually were here today. The government -- if you could
22
        just give me one moment, Your Honor?
23
                  THE COURT: Is there anything in the allocution
24
        that he said that she was 16?
25
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I don't recall that, Judge.
```

```
1
        don't think that was a part of the allocution.
 2
                  THE COURT: Yes, I don't think so either.
 3
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I think the allocution
 4
        indicated that the victims were under the age of 18, which is
        also a factor to be considered here, but that was a general
 5
        allocution to the victims generally.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Yes, but we have 16 which is a very
 8
        specific age.
 9
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
                  We're happy to agree to the level 37, Your Honor.
10
                  THE COURT: Yes, I think it may well may be that it
11
12
        will not make a difference, but we want to be circumspect.
        So then in paragraph 125, in respect to count 1, act E, we'll
13
14
        change that 37 also.
15
                  Now we go on to count 1, act F and that deals with
16
        Jane Doe Number 6. That should be 37. It's the same as all
17
        these others. So we have another 37.
18
                  And yet an additional 37 when it comes to count 1,
19
               That's Jane Doe Number 7.
                  And then the same with Jane Doe Number 8 --
20
21
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, we have an
22
        objection.
23
                  THE COURT: Just one second. Let me just -- Jane
24
        Doe Number 8 is a little different in one respect because
25
        there's two levels added to the fact that she was allegedly
```

choked and hit in the face that she became permanently scarred.

Yes, Mr. Obregon.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, we neglected to mention that one of the things that was given to us by the private investigator this morning for the first time is a picture of Jane Doe Number 8.

And this picture was taken by the investigator who's present in the courtroom a month ago. And according to the picture, she has no permanent scar on her face. There's actually multiple pictures that were given to us.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: And --

MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I just like state for the record that I've met Jane Doe Number 8 and I don't believe this is actually her. We may have a problem here, but this doesn't --

THE COURT: All right, so here's my --

MS. RYAN: -- look like the woman I remember.

THE COURT: -- here's my policy here. We could really get to the nitty gritty of this. There are all sorts of ways of doing it. I don't want to debate who has the burden of this or the burden of that.

I'm not going to -- since there's a question here,
I won't add two levels, so you have another 37. Okay. So we

1.3

are giving the defendant every benefit of all doubts here. I think considering the fact that they face maybe get life in prison and that -- it's not a bad policy for the Court to adopt under these circumstances.

Now let's move to count 1, act 1 and count 6. Now we're now segueing into the conspiracy to engage in sex trafficking and attempted sex trafficking for Jane Doe Number 9. So that adds the attempted sex trafficking. That's what make her situation different perhaps than the others. And we haven't adjusted level 31.

Do you take any exception to that Mr. --

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- Musa-Obregon.

Now we're dealing with the transportation for purposes of proposition. We have to go through all of those. So we start with Jane Doe Number 1. That's in count 7. And in paragraph 515, we have a base offense level of 27.

I take it you have no exception to that, Mr. Musa- $\mbox{\footnote{A}}$ Obregon, that it is --

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- correct.

And we have these four levels for the use of physical force that's been established. Then we have the specific offense characteristic number 2841b4b. Those numbers give the court reporters fits, don't they?

```
1
                  And that involves specifically what, Ms. Ryan?
 2
                  MS. RYAN: I just opened my book, Your Honor, to
        make sure I have it correct. It says, "If any" -- this is
 3
 4
        284.1b4. "If any other felony offense was committed during
        the commission of or in connection with the peonage or
 5
        involuntary servitude offense, increase to the greater of"
 6
 7
        and then sub b says --
 8
                  THE COURT: So that's because there was this other
 9
        criminal activity --
10
                  MS. RYAN: That's correct.
                  THE COURT: -- on top of that. So I think that's
11
12
        correct.
1.3
                  MS. RYAN: Yes, Judge. We agree.
                  THE COURT: All right, so two levels are added
14
15
        because that as a matter of law applies here. Then we have
16
        once again the vulnerable victims. I've ruled on that
        already.
17
18
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor?
19
                  THE COURT: Yes.
20
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: If I may, with respect to the
21
        allegation of a separate criminal act committed by Mr.
22
        Gerardo Flores, he is not in agreement with that. That was
23
        not part of the allocution.
24
                  MS. RYAN: It certainly was, Your Honor. The other
        felony here is the sex trafficking.
25
```

```
54
 1
                  THE COURT: He allocuted to the other crimes.
 2
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: All right.
 3
                  THE COURT: It's not a standalone crime here, you
 4
        see.
 5
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought the
        allocution was related to an attempted sexual assault of some
 6
 7
        sort.
 8
                  MS. RYAN: No, Your Honor, this -- count 7 that's
 9
        being discussed right now --
10
                  THE COURT: Right.
                  MS. RYAN: -- is the --
11
12
                  THE COURT: Transportation for purposes of
        prostitution of Jane Doe Number 1.
13
14
                  MS. RYAN: Correct.
15
                  THE COURT: And it calls for two level enhancement
16
        if in the course of that there was also another crime
17
        committed, right?
18
                  MS. RYAN: Yes, and there were several felonies
19
        committed in connection with this, alien smuggling and sex
20
        trafficking.
21
                  THE COURT: Right. Exactly.
22
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Okay. I'm going to withdraw the
        objection, Judge.
23
24
                  THE COURT: Okay, so that's 39. And then count 8
25
        we're now going to go through the other Jane Does. We have
```

another 39. These are all 39's for the same reasons that we just discussed in respect to count 7, so we need not take time -- further time to re-articulate all of this. Count 10, the same thing; transportation for purpose of prostitution of Jane Doe Number 4, so that's 39.

Now we come to count 15, paragraph 179. That's the conspiracy to commit eight substantive offenses, which are violations of 18 U.S.C. 1328. And we're talking about the importing aliens for illegal purposes and importation of Jane Doe 1 for immoral purposes. That's a different set of criminal activity. And then the base offense level is 27. Physical force is still applicable. That's four more levels. We're dealing with vulnerable victims. That's two levels. And once again, organizer of the criminal activity requires four levels. So the adjusted offense level for that crime is 37.

And that should be the same in respect to all of the other count 15 situations. Act B, for example, carries 37 for the same reason. Act C carries 37 also for the same reasons. Same thing with act D. Same thing with act E, except here we have 39.

And once again, it's going to be reduced to 37 because we're not going to hold the defendant accountable for the fact that the victim had not allegedly turned the age of 16. So that's 37.

Now, we're talking about count 15, act F and that will be again 37. And then count 15, act G will be 37.

Count 15, act H is going to be 37. We're not dealing with the question of choking and scarring. We made a determination about that before.

And the next grouping here we're talking about deals with the alien smuggling and alien smuggling for financial gain. And here on paragraph 230, we have a base offense level of 12.

And unless I hear some exceptions since I don't see where there's any basis for it, but nonetheless, you can speak, if you wish, Mr. Musa-Obregon. I come to a 21 adjusted offense level. Do you agree with that?

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Now we have the multiple count adjustment and we don't have any 39's anymore or are there any that are left?

MS. RYAN: I think they're all 37's now, Judge.

THE COURT: All 37's. I don't think it changes the multiple count adjustment, so on page 50, paragraph 241, we'll change that to 37 instead of 39. We'll do the same in respect to paragraph 244. And I think that's all we need to do.

But I still think it gets the same one count and I still think we come out with eight and a half total number of

1.3

units and we have a five unit cap on that. So, whichever way you slice it, we have to add five.

So, let's take the greater of the adjusted offense levels, which is 37, add the five increase, gives us a combined adjusted offense level of 42. And he gets acceptance of responsibility two levels.

MS. RYAN: Well, Your Honor, given the recent submissions, the government would actually like to be heard on that.

THE COURT: Doesn't sound as if they're accepting responsibility.

MS. RYAN: Exactly, they're trying to withdraw their pleas the day of sentence, Your Honor. I think that's a textbook rejection of responsibility and the government would object to those two levels being reduced to this calculation.

THE COURT: That makes --

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, there's --

THE COURT: That makes good sense to me. I mean the Court painstakingly went over all their rights. They have a last minute desire to withdraw their plea. They're going to complain that they weren't given effective counsel. They're going to make as much as they can over the Spanish documents submitted to the Court at the eleventh hour.

Doesn't sound like acceptance of responsibility,

Mr. Musa-Obregon.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, if I can speak on behalf of my defendant and also to some extent some of this can be transcended to the others, they've always wanted to accept responsibility with respect to portions of the charges in this case, Judge.

They will -- my client will freely acknowledge responsibility for being involved in prostitution related activities. He would have --

THE COURT: I don't understand that. You're saying that they accept responsibility for the serious prostitution charges. Is there any of these charges that they pled guilty that they do not accept responsibility for?

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor, I'm not saying that. I'm saying to the extent that the Court is taking the -- my client's latest ill-advised submission to withdraw the guilty plea as a --

THE COURT: What do you mean by ill-advised?

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, I -- Your Honor, it was not something that I prepared for him.

THE COURT: Right. So you can't control your client. Did you counsel your client about this matter -
MR. MUSA-OBREGON: It came as a total surprise to

THE COURT: Oh.

me, Judge.

```
59
 1
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: And I had no awareness that
 2
        was --
 3
                  THE COURT: The last minute surprise --
 4
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: And it arrived two days ago.
        think it was filed with the Court two days ago.
 5
                  THE COURT: All right.
 6
 7
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: There are issues in this case
 8
        that transcend the idea of complete acceptance or complete
 9
        rejection.
10
                  This was a global plea, Judge, that was offered by
        the government on the eve of trial and Mr. Carreto would have
11
12
        no problem today, based on my conversations with him,
        accepting responsibility for portions of it with the
13
14
        extent -- to the extent that he now has information that some
15
        of the witnesses that had been -- some of the witnesses that
16
        had previously, according to the government, held one
        position are now holding another and that he pled guilty to
17
18
        those witnesses. That -- I think that's part of the issue
19
        that -- but with -- he's generally accepted --
                  THE COURT: I don't understand. The --
20
21
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- responsibility --
22
                  THE COURT: -- application -- I know that you're
23
        not responsible for it and you can't be responsible for
24
        everything your client does or does not do. But the
        application was to withdraw his guilty plea in respect to all
25
```

```
of the charges, not some of the charges. I just went through, you know, nine Jane Does here. You're talking about perhaps three of these people. And, you know, your client wants to withdraw his guilty plea completely.
```

Do you think that's acceptance of responsibility?

I do not. So the -- he will not get any acceptance of responsibility and the total offense level is 22. You have your record and the Court is clear about the reason why the Court is --

MS. RYAN: I'm sorry, Judge, I believe --

THE COURT: -- not going to do that.

MS. RYAN: -- the offense level's a 42. I think the Court --

THE COURT: Did I say forty --

MS. RYAN: -- misspoke. You said 22, but it's 42.

THE COURT: I meant 42.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

And that with a criminal history category of one would call for a sentence of 360 months to life imprisonment. We know we have certain statutory maximums on these various charges, but counts 2 through 6 carry the 360 to life potential and the probation department recommended 35 years. Counts 1 and 7 through 27 have a five year cap which will run concurrent. So we understand.

```
1
                  Now it's 1:00. Do you wish at this time to speak
 2
        on behalf of your client before the Court imposes sentence?
 3
        I will say this: That I know there's some argument about
        whether 50 women were, you know, victimized, so to speak.
 4
        The government says that there is that type of evidence. I
 5
        don't see anything tangible about it. We know that a lot of
 6
 7
        victims were implicated here, but I'm not necessarily going
 8
        to proceed on the assumption that there was 50 or 40 or 30.
 9
        So you not -- need not be concerned about that. And what
        else do you wish me to take into consideration?
10
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Judge, in light of the
11
12
        fact that it is 1:00, I've been standing here for about --
        all of us for about an hour and a half, may we continue when
1.3
        we come back?
14
15
                  THE COURT: We can take a lunch break now. Would
16
        that be more comfortable for you?
17
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes.
18
                  THE COURT: Do you wish to have the victims speak
19
        now or later?
20
                  MS. RYAN: I can -- if the Court would -- I mean
21
        I'm --
22
                  THE COURT: It's up to them. If it's --
23
                  MS. RYAN: Right.
24
                  THE COURT: -- more convenient for them now, so
        they don't have to stay, but it's up to them.
25
```

```
62
 1
                  MS. RYAN: If you could just give us a moment to
        check with them, Your Honor.
 2
 3
                  THE COURT: Go ahead.
 4
             (Pause.)
 5
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, in any respect, regardless of
        whether the Court wants to continue at this point in time, my
 6
 7
        client had made a request that he be allowed to go to the
 8
        bathroom.
 9
                  THE COURT: The marshals are in charge of that.
        We're going to be leaving very quickly. He can hold out,
10
        hopefully. And you'll have ample opportunity during our
11
12
        lunch break to talk to him. Okay.
1.3
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand that --
                  THE COURT: Can the marshals allow him to use the
14
15
        facilities in the meantime while we're waiting, okay?
16
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Thank you.
17
                  THE INTERPRETER: There's two, Your Honor.
                                                               The
18
        other defendant also needs to go.
19
                  THE COURT: Well, let's -- look, since everybody
        has to use the facilities, we'll take out lunch break. The
20
21
        Court will be back --
22
                  MS. RYAN: That's fine.
23
                  THE COURT: -- 2:00.
24
                  MS. RYAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
25
                  MALE VOICE: 2:00?
```

```
63
 1
                  THE COURT: 2:00.
 2
             (Lunch recess 1:01 p.m. to 2:18 p.m.)
 3
                  THE COURT: Ready to continue?
 4
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, Your Honor.
                  MS. RYAN: We're ready, Judge.
 5
                  THE COURT: You're not going to have these victims
 6
 7
        speak?
 8
                  MS. RYAN: They're coming down the hall --
 9
                  THE COURT: They are coming.
                  MS. RYAN: -- as we speak.
10
                  THE COURT: All right, because I don't see them
11
12
        here I just wonder, since you were speaking to them, whether
1.3
        you want to report to the Court now as to whether they wish
14
        to be heard which is their right and because we're getting
15
        close to the point where they will be given that opportunity.
16
                  MS. RYAN: My understanding is that some of them do
        wish to be heard, Your Honor.
17
18
                  THE COURT: And I think probably the way to do it
19
        would be just before I call upon the defendant to ask whether
        he wishes to be heard, so that he'll have the benefit of
20
21
        hearing everything that has preceded. That sounds about
22
        right to me.
23
                  MS. RYAN: I had a slightly different idea, Judge,
24
        but I can certainly see the --
25
                  THE COURT: Tell me. It's all right.
```

1 MS. RYAN: -- validity of the position --2 THE COURT: I mean I have some flexibility here. 3 MS. RYAN: Obviously, the government's concern is 4 with the victims and that it's sort of the reverse concern that the defendant might say something that they would feel 5 that they might like to respond to for the Court to consider. 6 7 THE COURT: Well, you know, I guess the question is whether the defendant should have the last word before 8 9 sentence is imposed. My thinking is that probably is the way it should be. Because after all, the defendant is the one 10 that faces incarceration, not the victims. 11 MS. RYAN: I understand, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: All right. At this time, we made our 13 calculations and Mr. Musa-Obregon, I turn the courtroom over 14 15 to you if you wish to speak in behalf of where within the 16 range 360 to life your client should be sentenced. 17 MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, most respectfully, I 18 would ask the Court --19 THE COURT: Let me take it back. That's the 20 advisory range. You can also request that I sentence him to 21 less than the advisory range.

> MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, most respectfully, I do request the Court use the guidelines perhaps as in an advisory fashion, but not feel that it's bound by the quidelines as is your power. Mr. Carreto -- Gerardo Carreto

22

23

24

25

stands before you today as a man in his earlier years of life having not had a lot of experience as an adult before many of these things happened. Mr. Carreto has no criminal record as he appears before you. He has --

THE COURT: He has not been in this country for long, if I recall.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't remember how many months has it been.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I think it was a question of -it was a short period of time, Judge. I don't believe the
government's position is that he has a criminal record
anywhere in the world --

THE COURT: No, no, no, I understand that, but he -- all I'm suggesting is that, you know, when you say he has a criminal history category one, to some extent, that may be the product of the fact that he has only been in this country a short time. All right, go ahead.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Judge, I --

THE COURT: Your argument would take on greater significance if he had been here for let's say 20 years and was not involved with any criminal conduct than if he was here for matter of months or a few years.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I understand, Judge, but I don't think there's any evidence and I don't think the government,

1.3

certainly in its immense resources, would have been able to dig out any evidence of any other crimes that he would have been charged and convicted for in any other country. I don't think that's (indiscernible).

Mr. Carreto, Your Honor, is to some extent a product of his environment. There is -- and I don't know if the government will ever concede this, but in the town where he is from, prostitution is something that occurs very frequently. Many households, many families are involved in prostitution, based on the information that I have, and --

THE COURT: Yes, but, you know, I don't know whether if that be the case, it entailed what happened here. For example, maybe Mr. Innelli, the Court's outstanding clerk, could remind the name of the co-defendant who I sentenced who was the madame of the brothel in Coney Island.

THE CLERK: Edith Mosquera.

THE COURT: Mosquera.

THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: Excellent.

But I recall her testify that the women weren't given a penny. So they weren't even to earn a dishonest living, let alone an honest one. And that struck me as something that's -- you know, I recall as we go through this dialogue.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor, I'm glad that

the Court has mentioned this point. Mr. Carreto's position, as well as I believe other people involved in this case, is that although some of the profits were taken by him, it would not be improper to say that the women were not being given a penny, Judge. There's evidence that some of the women financed real estate back in their home country as a result of the prostitution --

THE COURT: Well, I'm just saying that at this prior sentencing -- and I can consider everything that relates to the sentence -- a co-defendant did say that, you know, they never got any money. They were picked up and, you know, that'll -- we can incorporate all of that in the sentencing proceeding. But she said that they were picked up. They weren't allowed to even go home on their own. They were taken back and forth to the place where they were kept basically slavery and that --

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: -- no -- I just want to point out to you so you can comment, if you wish, that there is that type of testimony under oath before me.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I understand that, Your Honor. Perhaps the other type of testimony that should be under oath before you is the following: Some of these women, Judge, did enjoy the opportunity of traveling on their own, meeting with their friends, et cetera, et cetera. It is inconceivable,

Your Honor, that the government's impression is that these women were held under lock and key. My discussions with the former chief of the general crimes of the U.S. Attorney's Office is not that it was that type of scenario, but it was, according to the government's theory, a type of psychological coercion, as opposed to --

THE COURT: Well, but you know they pled guilty to having, you know, visited physical force upon these people.

I mean that's what they said in their allocution. You know, this is a lot -- look, you have a hard job. There's no question. I'm not disrespecting you.

But I have to be frank my whole way which I handle sentences is to really enter into an interaction with counsel so that the sentence doesn't come as a surprise. You have the collective sense of where I'm thinking where I'm going as we discuss things.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes. Your Honor, I know Your
Honor is privy to a lot of information, some of which I'm not
privy to. But I think it would be naive of --

THE COURT: No, no, I'm not privy to any information that you're not privy to.

MS. RYAN: That's right.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I think it would be naive for the Court to believe that it would -- that these women were held under lock and key and that they were not free to ever

leave or anything like that, or that the -- that these women -- there are elements of voluntariness, as well as involuntariness to some of these activities, Judge.

The women were subcontracted by the defendant that you just mentioned, Edith Mosquera, to work in other homes where the defendants were not involved in. Those are things that perhaps the government should have made aware -- should have brought to your attention or did not. The women were taken to other homes out of the purview of the defendant and out of the purview of Ms. Mosquera even.

There were money transfers sent back and home -back and forth from the women to their very own families. I
think the government would be very hard pressed today to
stand here and tell you that these women were totally out of
control of their -- of all financial profits that were being
made --

THE COURT: The money went back, you know, to the Carreto family, not to the victims' families. There's nothing that I have that tells me or informs the Court that these monies went to the victims' family to help these poor people out.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor, certainly, portions and probably large portions went to the Carreto family, but not all of the money went to the Carreto family.

THE COURT: Well, you don't know that, do you, as a

matter --

1.3

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, this is the information that I received --

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, we have an investigator here, Judge, who came from Mexico, who was there four weeks ago and he's given us this information. He's met with the families. He's met with various people. He's learned that real estate was purchased by some of the victims' families as a result of remittances --

THE COURT: -- of your own factual knowledge?

THE COURT: All of that knowledge was within your client's awareness when your client pled guilty. He knew these women. He knew whether there were trials. I think there's some reference to some trials in Mexico. He was there. He had all the knowledge in the world. He didn't have to wait till the veritable twelfth hour to bring some of these facts out to muddy the record so that there's at least some colorable claim for appeal or 2255's.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: So --

THE COURT: He can't say that this is newly discovered evidence. He was there. He was knowledgeable about all this.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor, we knew that there were proceedings. However, when we asked the government do you have any records of proceedings, they

```
71
 1
        indicated that they did not and --
 2
                  THE COURT: And your clients weren't involved in
 3
        those proceedings? There's some reference that they were
 4
        acquitted on some of these proceedings.
 5
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor, from my
        understanding, they -- the proceedings that I know about my
 6
 7
        client -- he was here during the course of those proceedings.
 8
        And I did not see a transcript, Judge. People can conjecture
 9
        and talk about everything until this morning. That's why I
        did not want to waste anyone's time until --
10
                  THE COURT: I know you're --
11
12
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- I actually saw something.
                  THE COURT: I know you're in a hard spot here, but
13
14
        go ahead.
15
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: And, Your Honor, by no --
16
                  THE COURT: By the way, the investigator --
17
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- stretch of the --
18
                  THE COURT: Let me ask this just so the record's
19
        complete. The investigator that produced this Spanish
20
        document I assume is paid by your client and --
21
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes.
                  THE COURT: -- the defendants, right? So I quess
22
23
        they had more money at their disposal and more wealth at
24
        their disposal than the victims. Because you were making the
25
        argument that they --
```

```
72
 1
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Oh, I have --
 2
                  THE COURT: -- all came from poverty, but it seems
 3
        like --
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your --
 4
                  THE COURT: -- right there -- let me finish --
 5
 6
        is --
 7
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes.
 8
                  THE COURT: -- pretty good evidence, not that we
 9
        need it necessarily in the context of everything else, that
        your clients were more privileged than these other people
10
        because they were able to afford counsel, they were able to
11
12
        afford an investigator.
                  So, I'm not saying that they don't have a right to
13
        do that, but it does suggest that they were not on the same
14
15
        economic level as the victims. Okay, go ahead.
16
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes. Your Honor, by no stretch
        of the imagination am I trying to in any way excuse Mr.
17
18
        Carreto for the crimes that he's pled quilty to and for what
19
        he will be sentenced today.
20
                  I am merely making an argument of proportionality
21
        that there are elements to the government's case that are
22
        overblown. That is that there are elements that to the --
23
        certainly the number of people, certainly the number of --
24
                  THE COURT: I'm not -- I told you I'm not going
25
        to --
```

```
MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- certainly the financial
 1
 2
        disparity --
 3
                  THE COURT: I told you I'm not going to take the 50
        people into consideration. I don't have any hard evidence
 4
        about that. I think there's ample evidence to support there
 5
        is lots of money involved here without necessarily putting a
 6
 7
        particular dollar figure on it.
 8
                  So, you know, you can rest assured that your
 9
        arguments are well-intentioned and, you know, I'm taking them
10
        seriously. Go ahead.
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Right. Your Honor, to the
11
12
        extent that the Court is considering financial issues about
        investigators that the investigator, Judge, has been paid
13
        $3,000 for a two-week stay in --
14
15
                  THE COURT: I think I put it in proper context.
16
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, I understand. But I'm
        trying to say this was not -- he's essentially doing it pro
17
18
        bono from what I --
19
                  THE COURT: Right.
20
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- from what I'm hearing from
21
        him to the extent that he's going on a leap of faith and
22
        trying to vindicate these -- to the extent that he can,
23
        certain aspects --
24
                  THE COURT: But money was going back to the Carreto
```

family. We know that. I mean we know that from a number of

25

```
74
 1
        sources --
 2
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
 3
                  THE COURT: -- and you don't say otherwise.
 4
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: There is certainly an element of
        domination and control, et cetera, et cetera, but it is not
 5
        to say that they were living as virtual slaves, Judge, and
 6
 7
        that's the point I'm trying to make.
 8
                  THE COURT: You made your point.
 9
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: It may be more akin to the type
        of domination and control that exist in certain other types
10
        of scenarios, but it is not a slavery master type of
11
12
        relationship as the government would like to make it seem.
                  Mr. Carreto in all --
1.3
                  THE COURT: I didn't think the government made it
14
15
        seem that way at all. They pled guilty to 27 counts or the
16
        entire indictment. Who pleads guilty to an entire indictment
        if there's nothing very, very viable and compelling about the
17
18
        charges?
19
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well --
20
                  THE COURT: All right, go ahead.
21
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Well, Your Honor, one of the
        reasons they pled guilty, Judge, is because they were led to
22
23
        believe by the government that the victims in this case had
24
        absolutely nothing favorable to say about them --
25
                  THE COURT: They could have gone to trial.
```

```
75
 1
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- and that is directly
 2
        contradicted by the --
 3
                  THE COURT: They could have gone --
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: It is directly --
 4
                  THE COURT: -- to trial. They could have cross-
 5
       examined the witnesses. They had all these rights. All
 6
 7
       right, go ahead. What else?
 8
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: As lawyers --
 9
                  THE COURT: We were ready to go to trial.
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, as lawyers, Your Honor, we
10
       make it -- we make judgments based on the evidence that the
11
12
        other side shows us. We had no idea that these transcripts
        existed, which to a large extent, exonerates the defendants
13
14
       based on those particular witnesses, Judge.
15
                  THE COURT: Your argument's -- you keep coming back
16
       and that's all you're going to trot out before the Circuit
        Court of Appeals, but it's silly. Go ahead. What else?
17
18
                 MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Mr. Carreto, Judge, as a
19
        relatively young man, is keenly aware of --
                  THE COURT: How old is he? Thirty?
20
21
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I'm trying to remember, Judge.
22
                  MS. RYAN: He's 34.
23
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: I think he just turned --
24
                  THE COURT: Thirty-four.
25
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: -- 34.
```

```
76
 1
                  -- is keenly aware of the decisions that he's made
        in his life --
 2
 3
                  THE COURT: Are you suggesting because prostitution
 4
        may be rampant in Mexico that the United States of America
        should condone it --
 5
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, no.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: -- when it happens here?
 8
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, of course not, Judge. What
 9
        I'm trying to --
10
                  THE COURT: Or should we send a message out that we
11
        will do the opposite?
12
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: No, no, of course not. I don't
        think this should be a message case at all, Judge. I
1.3
14
        think --
15
                  THE COURT: You don't think so?
16
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, I think --
17
                  THE COURT: You don't think it's necessary to
18
        perhaps send a message to others who may want to come to the
19
        United States because they think prostitution is A-okay and
20
        everything else that happened here is okay?
21
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, I think Mr.
22
        Carreto --
23
                  THE COURT: You don't think they should be dealt
24
        harshly and a message should be sent that this is not going
25
        to be accepted in this country? Especially since you tell me
```

it's okay in Mexico.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Judge, I'm not saying it's okay. I'm saying it's something that happens in that particular town.

THE COURT: Maybe it won't happen in this country if the proper message is given. Go ahead.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, I think Mr.

Carreto --

THE COURT: We are not Mexico. I love Mexico.

Don't get me wrong, but we have different laws and different concepts of justice, perhaps.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, I think in this particular case, Mr. Carreto should be judged and sentenced according to his own actions. And I don't think this should be a test case or anything of the sort where I know the government spent millions of dollars on this particular case --

MS. RYAN: Your --

THE COURT: I'm going to sentence somebody because they pled guilty to 27 terrible counts of criminal behavior. That's why I'm going to sentence him. And it's going to be based upon the facts that I have and the law that I'm going to apply. That's all I'm going to do. Nothing else.

Anything else you have to say?

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Mr. Carreto, Judge, as he stands

before you, is at a crossroads in his life. He's 34 years old.

THE COURT: He is at a crossroads.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: And in this particular situation, Judge, I would ask you to consider sentencing him to 12 years. I think that would be a number that would certainly send out all the signals that the Court would like to --

THE COURT: All right. Well, you're doing a good job as his lawyer. We do candidly have different numbers in mind. Anything else you wanted to say?

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, Judge. The specific instances of violence that are directly attributed to him, Your Honor, are not particularly egregious or very -- in light of the entirety of this accusation, Judge, which is such a big case, the actual specific acts of violence that are attributed to him are not high in numbers, Judge. They're a few instances in the course of several years.

I ask the Court to take into account the totality of the circumstances in this case and sentence him to something outside of the range as I had indicated, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. I can only sentence him some -- outside the range if I depart from the lower and I can't sentence him outside in the higher end because the higher end is life. So we understand each other.

Now, Ms. Ryan, at this time, what do you wish to do?

MS. RYAN: Your Honor, if I could just respond to a few things that defense counsel just stated and then perhaps bring up --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. RYAN: -- some of the victims to speak.

In no particular order. In response to Mr.

Obregon's assertion that the government had only said that the victims in this case had only had one position and now there may be this mysterious second position that's more favorable to their clients, I'll simply state that as is customary in this district prior to trial, the victims who were going to be trial witnesses we provided *Giglio* materials in a letter to the defense in accordance with our obligations and there were indications in those letters that at particular points in time, there were statements made by these victims that could arguably used -- be used for cross-examination --

THE COURT: Now I haven't seen that. And no, it isn't necessary for me to have seen that, unless it was called to my attention. But you are making a representation now as an officer of the court, as well as persons upholding the hard traditions of your office, that all *Giglio* material was turned over and that includes statements by some of these

```
people that suggested that they were making up these stories?
 1
 2
                  MS. RYAN: No, Your Honor, that's not what I'm
 3
        saying. What I'm saying is that we, in our Giglio letter,
 4
        disclosed that one of the victims in this case had given a
        statement down in Mexico at some point to the best of our
 5
        understanding, but it was at the request of the defendants.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Did you disclose what that statement
 8
        was or you had no knowledge?
 9
                  MS. RYAN: We disclosed our sum and -- the best
        understanding we had of the sum and substance of those
10
        statements. We did not physically have those statements
11
12
        because they were in control of the Mexican government.
1.3
                  THE COURT: Do you have an idea what the sum and
        substance were what you disclosed to the defendants in your
14
15
        Giglio disclosure?
16
             (Pause.)
17
                  THE COURT: Make sure you have it accurate because
18
        you're making a representation --
19
                  MS. RYAN: Absolutely, Judge.
20
                  THE COURT: -- that you made these disclosures.
21
                  MS. RYAN: I think that our disclosure was somewhat
22
        general, Your Honor, and it's been a while since I looked at
23
        it, but I think it had something to do with --
24
                  THE COURT: Just be careful because, you know, if,
25
        in fact, there were disclosures that arguably could have some
```

```
81
 1
        relevancy on some issues here.
 2
                  MS. RYAN: I just wanted to make the Court aware
 3
        that we've complied with our Giglio obligations here.
 4
                  THE COURT: You're backing away a little bit now.
        I mean I have to be fair --
 5
                  MS. RYAN: I don't want to misspeak, Your Honor. I
 6
 7
        don't have the letter with me here today.
 8
                  THE COURT: You ought not be to misspeak. Be very
 9
        careful.
                  MS. RYAN:
                             Thank you.
10
                  THE COURT: What else?
11
                  MS. RYAN: With respect to Mr. Obregon's comment
12
13
        that the violence perpetrated by Gerardo Flores Carreto
14
        really wasn't so bad, it wasn't so often, just by way of
15
        example, Your Honor, I'd like to point you to paragraphs 59
16
        of the presentence report on page 16 where referenced to him
        repeatedly raping one of the victims in this case after
17
18
        basically kidnapping her.
19
                  In paragraph 60, the final sentence of that
20
        paragraph is that he hit the victim repeatedly in the face
21
        with a cable, leaving her bloody and bruised.
22
                  THE COURT: That comes from I quess it's
23
        information obtained from the victims --
24
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
```

THE COURT: -- I assume.

25

MS. RYAN: So, the government takes issue with his characterization of his client's level of violence in this case. To best of our knowledge, he was an extremely violent person who routinely beat his victims and threatened them with death.

With respect to his -- defense counsel's comments that -- about voluntariness generally in these kinds of cases, I just like to remind the Court about the -- what the Trafficking Victims Protection Act indicates which is that you don't need to have someone chained up in order to have total control of them. The congress has recognized the kind of control that human traffickers have over their victims and that was certainly at play here. That's just simply not necessary. They don't need to be locked up. These women were under the complete control of the defendants.

THE COURT: There's a congressional finding here.

MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor.

Also just the defendant's own words contradict some of defense counsel statements here. The defendant, as the Court has recognized repeatedly, pled guilty to the indictment in this case and he pled guilty to forcing his victims to commit prostitution. He also --

THE COURT: He allocuted to that.

MS. RYAN: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: He specifically allocuted to that --

```
1
                  MS. RYAN: He specifically -- on page 76 and page
 2
        77 of the quilty plea transcript, he specifically allocated
 3
        to forcing specific victims into prostitution.
 4
                  THE COURT: Allocute, not --
 5
                  MS. RYAN: Thank you very much, Judge. He also
        admitted to using force against these victims. And he
 6
 7
        specifically allocuted to the fact that he didn't allow these
 8
        victims to keep any money they received from engaging in
 9
        prostitution.
10
                  THE COURT: That's right. Now you remind me of
11
        that.
12
                  MS. RYAN: He specifically admitted that during his
13
        quilty plea.
14
                  THE COURT: Shall we hear from the victims at this
15
        point?
16
                  MS. RYAN: One moment, Judge.
17
             (Pause.)
18
                  MS. RYAN: One thing I just would like to clarify,
19
        Judge, with respect to the monies that were sent from New
20
        York down to Mexico that were the proceeds of the forced
21
        prostitution activity. The lion share of that money did go
22
        to the Carreto family organization to co-conspirators.
23
        Sometimes the defendants themselves when they were still in
24
        Mexico. There were very small instances where victims were
25
        permitted by the defendants to send nominal amounts to their
```

own family members.

1.3

2.1

For example, they were allowed to send \$80 or \$100 once or twice over the entire course of the offense conduct. Meanwhile, thousands of dollars were being sent each week by the defendants back to the criminal organization.

THE COURT: You have any specific knowledge of that, how much money was sent down there? I know that there's references to all of this in your letter, but --

MS. RYAN: We -- in preparation for trial, Your Honor, and as indicated in our letter that was filed yesterday, hundreds of pages of wire transfer records were provided in discovery to the defense and the government reviewed those obviously and we came up with some round numbers, but we're not confident that that's all the money that was sent.

THE COURT: Based upon the wiretaps and you turned them over to defendants --

MS. RYAN: Not wiretaps, Judge, wire -- money remitters.

THE COURT: Money wired.

MS. RYAN: Wire -- money wires.

THE COURT: Wired monies.

MS. RYAN: Yes.

THE COURT: What did that come out to that was actually turned over to the defendants --

```
85
 1
                  MS. RYAN: It was --
 2
                  THE COURT: -- roughly?
 3
                  MS. RYAN: It was in excess of $150,000 that had
        been sent during certain points in time. We had incomplete
 4
 5
        records and incomplete information.
                  THE COURT: At the very minimum, it was at least
 6
 7
        that that was --
 8
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
                  THE COURT: -- documented and --
 9
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
10
                  THE COURT: -- the defendants were apprised of
11
12
        that --
1.3
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
                  THE COURT: -- by giving them notice and copies of
14
15
        the wire --
16
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
17
                  THE COURT: -- transfers.
18
                  MS. RYAN: That's correct.
19
                  THE COURT: Anything else?
20
                  MS. RYAN: No, Judge, I think I'd like to see if
21
        any of the victims would like to speak --
22
                  THE COURT: Let's do that now.
23
                  MS. RYAN: Thank you.
24
             (Pause.)
25
                  THE COURT: Yes, now who do we have here?
```

```
86
 1
                  OLIVIA: Olivia. I am the victim of Gerardo
 2
        Flores.
 3
                  THE COURT: All right, now she doesn't have to be
        placed under oath, but I'll leave the choice to her if she
 4
 5
        wants to.
                  OLIVIA: I do.
 6
                  THE COURT: All right, so at this time, the clerk
 7
 8
        of the court, who has just left --
 9
                  Mike, do you want to place this person under oath,
        please?
10
                  THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.
11
12
                  THE COURT: That's what her preference is.
13
                  THE CLERK: First I'll ask the interpreter if you
        can raise your right hand.
14
15
             (The interpreter is sworn.)
16
                  THE CLERK: Please state and spell your name for
        the record.
17
18
                  THE INTERPRETER: Libia Clancy, C-l-a-n-c-y.
19
                  THE CLERK: Thank you.
20
                  I ask the victim if you could raise your right
21
        hand?
22
             (Olivia Gutierrez is sworn.)
23
                  THE COURT: All right, now bear in mind since
24
        you -- I gave you the choice of whether you wanted to talk to
25
        me under oath or not, so by choosing to speak under oath,
```

```
1
        that means if you do not speak truthfully, you run the risk
        of being prosecuted for perjury or making a false statement
 2
 3
        under oath. I just want to counsel you about that.
 4
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Your Honor, I'll raise an issue. I
        have an objection to the use of this interpreter. It's an
 5
        interpreter hired by the government. I would ask the Court
 6
 7
        to have an official court interpreter. This is a woman who
 8
        was at every proffer session used by the government. She
 9
        works specifically for the U.S. Attorney's Office. I can
        already tell by the emphasis which she placed the name of the
10
        defendant upon the record that she is not --
11
12
                  THE COURT: Not -- yes, go ahead.
1.3
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- a impartial --
                  THE COURT: Here's what we'll do.
14
15
                  Ms. Ryan, the interpreter has credentials that you
16
        know of?
                  MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor.
17
18
                  THE COURT: All right. State it on the record.
19
                  MS. RYAN: My understanding is that Ms. Clancy is a
20
        certified Spanish interpreter and that she in fact worked in
21
        this courthouse for many years.
                  THE COURT: Ms. Clancy, are you certified as a --
22
23
                  THE INTERPRETER: Yes, I am.
24
                  THE COURT: -- official interpreter?
25
                  THE INTERPRETER: Since 1980.
```

```
1
                  THE COURT: And how long have you been working in
        this courthouse as an interpreter?
 2
 3
                  THE INTERPRETER: Since 1966.
                  THE COURT: All right, that's on the record.
 4
                  Now. we'll do something else, Mr. --
 5
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, my problem was not the fact
 6
 7
        that Ms. Clancy is a certified Spanish interpreter. It is
 8
        with the fact that she is retained and paid by the U.S.
 9
        Attorney's Office, not by the court. She is not an
10
        independent contractor. She is an employee of the United
        States Attorney's Office.
11
12
                  THE COURT: That's doesn't mean she's not
13
        qualified --
14
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, she actually is an
15
        independent contractor. She is not an employee of the United
16
        States Attorney's Office. She is a contractor --
17
                  THE COURT: She's a contractor --
18
                  MS. RYAN: -- who does work for our office.
19
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: But she works for their office, not
20
        for the courts.
                  THE COURT: All right, Mr. Hochbaum, you made your
2.1
22
        record.
23
                  Now, Mr. Musa-Obregon, you're still here.
24
                  MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Yes, I am, Your Honor.
25
                  THE COURT: So you come forward and stand up here,
```

since you are fluent in Spanish. It's good to wear suspenders and a belt. As an officer of the court, you listen carefully to Ms. Clancy's interpretation. If there's anything that strikes you as odd or not evenhanded, you let me know as an officer of the court. Okay, thank you.

All right, now continue. Let me hear from -Your name again is?

MS. GUTIERREZ: Olivia Gutierrez.

THE COURT: I'll call you Olivia. You're free to speak as a victim. You have the right to address the Court at this time if you choose to do so. Go ahead.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Okay. I understand the defense attorneys that is their job to defend them. But actually, they were never in my shoes. They never knew what I actually had to live through because it's not difficult because it's not the same to say something that you live in.

So, what I am asking you is to give this man,

Gerardo Flores, the high conviction that they deserve because
he in fact has hurt a lot. There are a lot of victims, not
just myself. I am the person who started in prostitution
prior to my 16th birthday. And I know him well. So, the
only thing that I would also like to ask you is that my
daughter be returned to me because he took her away. She is
now eight years old and I don't even know her. And they
still have her.

```
1
                  THE COURT: Do you know where your daughter is
 2
        today?
 3
                  MS. GUTIERREZ: No. I have an idea that she is
 4
        with her family, but only because of the process that I'm
        undergoing in Mexico for the custody.
 5
                  THE COURT: All right. So you -- thank you very
 6
 7
        much. Muchos gracias.
 8
                  Anybody else wish --
 9
                  You may sit down. Thank you.
             (Pause.)
10
                  MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor, there's another victim.
11
12
        If I could just clarify or add something to what Olivia just
        stated, the government has been trying to make efforts to
13
        help with returning her daughter to her and have not
14
15
        succeeded yet. Just want to put that on the record.
16
                  THE COURT: Now who do we have here now?
17
                  MS. CRUZ: My name is Maria (indiscernible) Garcia
18
        Cruz.
19
                  THE COURT: All right, now I'll give you the same
20
        option that I gave to the prior person. You can speak to the
21
        Court. You don't have to be placed under oath. But if you
        wish to be placed under oath and swear to the truthfulness of
22
23
        your comments, I'll give you the opportunity to do that if
24
        that is your desire.
25
                  MS. CRUZ: I do.
```

THE COURT: All right, so the clerk of the court will administer an oath to you.

THE CLERK: I ask you'll raise your right hand?

(Maria Cruz is sworn.)

THE CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Now, before you continue since you have taken an oath, be mindful now that if you do not speak the truth, that you could be prosecuted for perjury or rendering a false statement under oath. Bear that in mind and at this time, you're free to speak to me as you choose.

MARIA: Yes. Your Honor, I am here because I want these people to be punished with a very stern sentence for them. I was badly hurt. They abused me, seduced me, abused me and tried to woo me. He wooed me so much only so that I would go work for him.

Aside from that, he played with my feelings. He toyed with my life. And he stepped on me as though I were garbage. He did not have the slightest consideration towards me, towards my daughters.

And frankly, I know they don't have the slightest idea what the value of a human being is. They don't care about destroying people's lives because what they want is money. What they want is to dominate the world by having a lot of women to themself. They feel like gods before a woman who has no defense because she's beaten and they totally

```
92
 1
        mistreat them or --
 2
                  THE COURT: Anything else?
                  MS. CRUZ: That's all.
 3
 4
                  THE COURT: Thank you very much.
                  Anybody else, Ms. Ryan?
 5
                  MS. RYAN: Let me check, Your Honor.
 6
 7
                  Yes, Your Honor.
 8
             (Pause.)
 9
                  THE COURT: All right, and your name?
                  MS. PALMERA: Veronica Palmera.
10
                  THE COURT: All right, Miss Palmera, once again,
11
12
        you can talk to me without being placed under oath. That's
        perfectly acceptable. But if you choose, you can also take
13
        an oath which means you'll swear to the truth and I'll give
14
15
        you the option either way.
16
                  MS. PALMERA: I just want to talk without having to
        be under oath. I just want to tell you something.
17
18
                  THE COURT: Go ahead.
19
                  UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Your Honor, I ask that she --
20
                  MS. CRUZ: The harm that you have --
21
                  THE COURT: Excuse me, stop one second. What?
22
                  MS. CRUZ: -- caused is irreversible.
23
                  THE COURT: Just one second.
24
                  UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm sorry, Judge, I ask that
25
        she identify who she's talking --
```

```
93
 1
                  THE COURT: Who are you speaking about?
                  MS. CRUZ: Gerardo Flores Carreto.
 2
 3
                  THE COURT: Go ahead.
 4
                  MS. CRUZ: The harm you have caused is
        irreversible. It's not fair. As a woman, I cannot wish that
 5
        upon anybody and as a man, you're not worth it. That's all.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Thank you very much.
 8
                  Anybody else?
 9
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I think -- Your Honor, we're
10
        having a little bit of confusion here because some of the
        women were primarily victimized by one particular defendant
11
12
        as opposed to another, but if the Court is willing to listen
        to the victims generally now --
13
14
                  THE COURT: The ones who spoke so far I take it
15
        they were talking about the defendant, Gerardo Flores
16
        Carreto. We should clarify that if there is any -- if I'm
        under an improper --
17
18
                  MS. RYAN: No, you're --
19
                  THE COURT: -- understanding.
20
                  MS. RYAN: -- 100 percent correct.
21
                  THE COURT: All right. Now let's hear from this
22
        person.
23
                  Your name?
24
                  MS. ROMERO: Veronica Romero.
25
                  THE COURT: Romero, is it?
```

THE INTERPRETER: Romero.

1.3

THE COURT: Okay. Do you wish to testify -- do you wish to speak under oath or without taking an oath?

MS. ROMERO: No oath.

THE COURT: All right, you're not going to be talking to me under oath. You can say what you wish to say.

MS. ROMERO: What I'm going to say goes to Josue Flores.

THE COURT: Just one second. I'll listen to you, even though we're not talking about Gerardo. I understand what you're saying now doesn't deal with Gerardo, but deals with Josue. All right, go ahead.

MS. ROMERO: Yes. I hope that justice is properly applied. He hurt me a great deal. And it was not fair when my parents came to visit me at his house that they were beaten by Josue. His mother tried to beat up my parents who were just trying to come visit me. And when I realized that, it was too late to see my parents when they were being beaten up. And I hope that justice is done because of that. That's all that I ask you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Now the folks who spoke before they were speaking only about Gerardo or they wish to be heard with respect to the other defendants as well? I just have to be clear about that.

MS. RYAN: I appreciate that, Your Honor. The first three women who spoke were speaking about Gerardo Flores Carreto. The woman who just spoke was speaking in reference to Josue Flores Carreto. And we have other victims here who may or may not choose to speak with respect to the other defendant, Daniel Perez Alonso. If we -- I'll leave it to the Court's discretion as to --

THE COURT: Well, it might be best if --

MS. RYAN: -- when that is appropriate.

THE COURT: -- we just had those people speak in respect to this particular defendant and to indicate whether they are commenting about more than just this defendant, so the record is clear what we are referring to. Anybody else now?

MS. RYAN: We'll check.

(Pause/Court and clerk confer.)

THE COURT: Yes, we have someone else?

MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I just checked with the victims. With respect to the defendants that have -- with respect to Gerardo Flores Carreto, no one else wishes to say anything at this moment. With respect to the other defendants generally, no one wishes to say anything else right now. I would ask the Court for the opportunity to check with them again after they've heard some of the additional statements that defense counsel may make to see if

they change their minds.

1.3

THE COURT: All right, I think that is clear enough now.

All right, at this time, the defendant, Gerardo Flores Carreto, is entitled to speak to the Court before sentence is imposed.

And, Mr. Musa-Obregon, would you have him step up here. If he wishes to speak to me, that is his right.

(Pause.)

DEFENDANT GERARDO CARRETO: Good afternoon. First of all, what I would like to say is the victims that spoke just now is their word against mine.

THE COURT: They're what?

THE INTERPRETER: It's their word against mine.

THE COURT: I understand.

DEFENDANT GERARDO CARRETO: From the very beginning I said that I was guilty of prostitution, not that I was a coyote (phonetic)or the other things that I'm being accused of.

THE COURT: You pled guilty to all those. You allocuted. You specifically told me that your crimes involve more than just simple prostitution. You talked about physical beatings. You talked about being an organizer. You talked about alien smuggling. You talked about sex trafficking. You said that through your own lips after I

questioned you extensively. You had the right to go forward with your trial and maybe your defenses that you think you had would have gone out, but you pled guilty to everything, not just prostitution.

DEFENDANT GERARDO CARRETO: I'm sorry for my ignorance. First of all, I don't know English. Second, my attorney knew that there is evidence and that I wanted to go to trial.

THE COURT: You refuse to accept responsibility.

You're telling me you lied when you told me under oath that you were guilty. You told me you -- in effect you're telling me you lied when you explained the circumstances of your criminal activity in response to my questions when I asked you to tell me what you did to justify my accepting your plea of guilty. You are not accepting responsibility and you are lying to the Court now. What else do you have to say?

DEFENDANT GERARDO CARRETO: No, I'm sorry. It's just that it was confusion.

THE COURT: I tried my very best ability to make sure there was no confusion. I gave you time and again, you know, information about your rights. I protected your right to have counsel who would be competent and who would protect your interest. I did everything imaginable to make sure you understand every single thing that was happening. You had the ability to have counsel and interpreters as well explain

1.3

everything to you thoroughly. So the fact that you don't speak English doesn't really enter into the equation here, does it?

DEFENDANT GERARDO CARRETO: With all due respect to you, once I emphasized to have my attorney changed. You did not allow it.

THE COURT: I asked you specifically whether you were satisfied with Mr. Lashley's services and told you how important it was for me to make sure that you were comfortable with that. You told me under oath that you were. You told me that you were going to withdraw any complaints against Mr. Lashley. I told you --

MR. HOCHBAUM: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- how important it was for me to explain that to you.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Your Honor, this defendant was never represented by Mr. Lashley.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. My mistake, but we went through all of your rights as to whether or not you have been given proper counsel. Now you're telling me you weren't given proper counsel. My mistake. I thought you were -- Mr. Lashley was your attorney because that was the arguments that were made about him. I didn't realize you had similar complaints. This is the first I'm really hearing of that so specifically. Go ahead. I'm sorry, my apologies.

DEFENDANT GERARDO CARRETO: How could I go to trial? First of all, I have no relatives here. No one. I had no proof. Everything had to come from Mexico. I don't know. I'm confused now. I don't know what to do. There is evidence that shows that I'm not guilty. There's a video where more than one victim threatens death and I don't know why. Now the girls are alleging this. I don't know. We were never allowed to speak with them. Supposedly she's my wife supposedly because -- I don't know what's going on.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

DEFENDANT GERARDO CARRETO: Please have mercy.

Show the evidence. Please. Think that it is my life out of state and I have a daughter; nine year old daughter. She said eight years. She never dealt with my daughter. She never bothered to make a phone call and I never forbid her to do anything. She could have gone any day at any time. What was the pressure on her? What was — what were the threats? When my daughter had her three year birthday, her mother and her sister were at the party. Everything she has said is a lie.

And if it's true that when I left her, why did she continue with prostitution? That makes no sense. They had a cellular phone. They could go out at any time they wanted. There's evidence of that. Unfortunately, it all came too late because it's all in Spanish. Have mercy. It's my life.

Be merciful.

1.3

THE COURT: All right. In imposing sentence, the Court considers the advisory guideline range of 360 months to life and also the factors set forth in 18 United States Code Section 3553(a). And in particular, the following aspects of that subsection. One, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant.

In that respect, the nature and circumstances of the offense I find to be appalling. We're not talking about one victim. We're not talking about two victims. We're talking about multiple victims that the defendant pled guilty to violating in a number of ways.

And the Court doesn't have, as hard as I have searched, the proper words to express the Court's shock and disgust for the nature of the criminal behavior of this defendant. The Court cannot overlook and will not overlook the nature of the multiple charges and the pleas by the defendant to each and every one of those charges, the physical factors associated with them, the vulnerability of the victims and all of these other aspects that make these crimes horrendous.

Now, the statute also speaks about the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect to the law and to provide just punishment for the offense. And also talks about the need to afford

1.3

adequate deterrence to criminal conduct in the United States.

I'm not going to speak about Mexico. I have great respect

for the country, Mexico. I can only talk about the laws of

the United States which I am familiar with.

We do not condone the crimes that you have pled guilty to and sex trafficking and all these other crimes that you have pled guilty to are things which, in this country of ours, we take a very, very very dim view of.

And it's, I think, terribly important in particular in this case to send a message loud and clear that people -- I don't care where they come from, whether they come from the United States, Mexico, any place.

If they commit these crimes in the United States, they're going to be treated harshly by the law. We look upon these types of crimes as amongst the most seriousness -- I should say amongst the most serious of crimes that can be committed.

The violation of women, the disrespect for women, all of these issues are matters which we take quite seriously in this country and our laws reflect that. And a stiff sentence is required here in my opinion to send a clear message that these types of criminal conduct will not be tolerated under our laws.

And of course, you know, we want to protect the public from further crimes of this nature. There's nothing

that suggests to me that the defendants would not return to their crimes. They have a hard time accepting responsibility for their acts here. We've discussed that at length and I think those factors all suggest that the Court must deal harshly in sentencing this defendant.

I don't see any particular history or characteristics of the defendant that weight so heavily in his favor to great the type of leniency that the defendant would like to have the Court visit upon.

I've considered all the factors under 3553(a), as well as the advisory guideline range and I think the reasonable sentence in this particular -- in this case is 50 years of incarceration on counts 2 through 6. They will run concurrent on each other. There will be five years of supervised release with a special condition that the defendant, if deported, may not re-enter the United States illegally.

Respect to counts 1 and counts 7 through 27, there is a five year maximum will be imposed on each count. They will be concurrent to each other and concurrent to the 50 years imposed on counts 2 through 6 all to run concurrent with each other.

There is no fine that's going to be imposed upon the defendant. He doesn't have the capacity to pay a fine. There's a mandatory \$2,700 for special assessment purposes.

That's \$100 for each of the 27 crimes that the defendant has pled guilty to.

There are general conditions of supervised release, which the Court is going to give to the defendant. I should say on counts 1 and 7 through 27, the period of supervised release is three years. That will run concurrent with the five years in respect to the other counts.

The general conditions of supervised release are begin given to the defendant in Spanish and you are to read them and to abide by their conditions if and when they become applicable.

Last, there is nothing that tells me that you have waived your rights of appeal.

MS. RYAN: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And so I advise you at this time that you have that right. And certainly, I would encourage you to exercise that right. Considering the stiff sentence I've imposed upon you, you would be fool hearty not to try to get that overturned. And you would protect your rights by asking for counsel to be assigned to represent you on appeal, if you were not able to afford to pay for counsel.

And in any event, a notice of appeal would have to be filed within 10 days that the written judgement will be entered and you would have to perfect your appellate rights thereafter by -- within 30 days, unless you were to get an

extension of time from the court of appeals, which undoubtedly would be given to you. You can make application if you need more time to perfect your rights at least to prepare the record and the appeal and do whatever else you have to do firm up your appellate rights.

Now is there anything the Court may have inadvertently omitted?

MS. RYAN: There's one thing I've noticed, Your Honor. It's really more of a --

THE COURT: There's one thing I'm going to say. Maybe it's the same thing you're thinking of.

Because I've sentenced you to a period of incarceration in excess of 24 months from the lower level of the advisory range, it may well be that the law still requires me to state specifically the reasons why I've done that, since there's a great separation.

I'm not so sure that that still applies given the advisory nature of sentences now, but in any event, for all the reasons that I explained to you, I feel that the 600 months is cundicated (phonetic) here. Three hundred and sixty months, which is the low end of the advisory range, I don't think would be adequate for purposes of the deterrence and respect for the law and all these other factors I have set forth with you. So those same factors have informed the Court that the sentence should be the 50 years.

Anything else, Ms. Ryan?

MS. RYAN: One thing, Your Honor. Under the statute that this defendant's been convicted of, there's a mandatory restitution provision.

THE COURT: I notice that, but the presentence report suggest that there's no way of determining whether there is restitution in this case.

MS. RYAN: We would like the opportunity to brief that, Your Honor. We have a 90 day period after the judgment is entered in the case in order to do that. Especially based on the information we've learned today that they've been able to pay for an investigator down in Mexico. They've been able to retain counsel. There may be funds that are available and should be owed to the victims.

THE COURT: I'm not going to impose that now because based upon the information that I have, there's no basis for me to impose any restitution sum. If you think you have rights within 90 days to make submissions to me, I'll take it under advisement. But, you know, as a practical matter, I don't know really whether it's really fruitful for you to pursue that, but I don't want to preclude you from exercising your rights to do so.

MS. RYAN: We'll look into it. Thank you, Judge.

MR. MUSA-OBREGON: Your Honor, in light of the extensive -- enormous sentence you have imposed on my client,

```
1
        we would ask for -- to foreclose as possible and
        (indiscernible) restitution. Mr. Carreto has already been
 2
 3
        (indiscernible) on probation (indiscernible) --
                  THE COURT: Well, if restitution is mandatory and
 4
        there is a basis for it, then I have no flexibility and --
 5
                  MS. RYAN: That's correct.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: -- choice, but, you know, I suggested
 8
        to the government that maybe under the circumstances, you
 9
        know, you might be hard press to find a valid basis for
        restitution in this case so we can serve an end to all of
10
        this at this particular time. Think about that.
11
12
                  Anything else?
                  Just one second.
1.3
             (Pause/Court and clerk confer.)
14
15
                  THE COURT: I think that completes the sentence.
16
        We'll take a 10 minute recess before we proceed with the next
        sentence.
17
18
             (Recess 3:15 p.m. to 3:43 p.m.)
19
                  THE COURT: We've already flushed out all the
        preliminaries and we have the presentence report here, and I,
20
21
        you know, rejected the application to adjourn the matter, so
22
        this matter will go forward for sentencing now.
23
                  Have you given your client, Josue Flores Carreto, a
24
        copy of the presentence report, Mr. Kulcsar?
25
                  MR. KULCSAR: Yes, I have reviewed it with him with
```

107 1 the assistance of a Spanish speaking paralegal. THE COURT: You were there at the time? 2 3 MR. KULCSAR: I'm sorry, Your Honor? 4 THE COURT: You were there at the time? Was the presentence report read to him and all its essential aspects? 5 MR. KULCSAR: Yes. 6 7 THE COURT: And you were there and you discussed it 8 fully with him? 9 MR. KULCSAR: Yes. THE COURT: And he understands his context. You're 10 satisfied with that? 11 12 MR. KULCSAR: Yes. THE COURT: All right. So let me tell you what I 1.3 have here. Of course, the underlying plea minutes of April 14 15 5, 2005 will be deemed to be part of the sentencing file. 16 The presentence report is dated January 25, 2006. Of course in many respects, it's similar to Gerardo's presentence 17 18 report, but we'll go through very specifically. 19 I have the sentencing recommendation and I take it 20 you have received a copy of it, Mr. Kulcsar? 21 MR. KULCSAR: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: And the government of course has it. 23 And the recommended sentencing here is the same for this 24 defendant as for his brother who was just sentenced, and that 25 was 35 years on counts 2 through 6 and five years on counts 1

and 7 through 27 all concurrent. And the comments are basically the same as the comments in respect to his brother.

Now in addition I have the joint letter of April 24th, 2006 that was submitted by Mr. Alonso and the two Flores's and I referred to that before, and that's signed by each of them. And I have Mr. Kulcsar's letter of April 22nd, 2006, speaking about three level downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility and the objection to the two level upward adjustment for obstruction of justice. And a sentencing sheet I have in the file as well.

And then I have the letter from the government signed by Daniel Alonso -- the Government's Daniel Alonso and Ms. Ryan. That's dated April 5, 2005. And that's in respect to the *Pimentel* letter. And think that's all that I have in respect to the sentencing file, except for of course the government's letter that I mentioned before in respect to all three defendants which will be deemed part of this file also. And that was dated, I think, April 26.

Mr. Innelli, that letter may be in the other file. We'll make copies of that letter of the government and place them in each of these files.

MS. RYAN: I have extra copies with me, Your Honor.

I'm happy to give those to the Court. If you like.

THE COURT: Well, let me have it in front of me now.

109 1 THE CLERK: It's not here, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: We can make the copies --3 THE CLERK: It's not in this file. 4 (Pause/Court and clerk confer.) 5 THE COURT: All right, I do have it. It was just buried under some papers. So that will be deemed part of 6 7 this file as well. And there's Exhibit A annexed thereto. 8 Is there anything, Mr. Kulcsar, that I don't have 9 that I should have? 10 MR. KULCSAR: I assume, Your Honor, before getting into a great deal of detail, you're going to make the same 11 12 adjustment with respect to the physical injury claim that was put forth. 13 14 THE COURT: What I want to do is go through count 1 15 and I think this will get a -- probably come out the same as 16 his brother's, but we'll make the same adjustments here. 17 Let's turn to them now. 18 And on page 34, with count 1, act A, we'll have an 19 adjusted offense level of 30 -- well, we want to talk about that. It may be 39. Here we have the obstruction of justice 20 21 aspect here and so we want to separately consider that. My 22 quess is that when all is said and done, it'll come out 23 probably in the same range, but we still have to be 24 circumspect in making these advisory guideline calculations. 25 But the government says that there was this

recorded phone conversation with Veronica, is it?

MS. RYAN: No, Your Honor. It's Jane Doe No. 8 (indiscernible) Mexico. And her name -- her first name is Minerva.

THE COURT: Minerva.

MR. KULCSAR: That's the same person that's allegedly the victim of the bodily injury for whom we have a --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KULCSAR: -- photograph showing that she was not disfigured or scarred.

THE COURT: But we do have the actual transcript of the conversation and the conversation tells her that, you know, you know the right thing to do, stuff like that.

There's certainly at the very least a veil threat. And after that she stopped cooperating.

Let's hear from the government.

MS. RYAN: That's exactly right, Your Honor. When the government was investigating this case, we had the opportunity to meet with her and speak with her and she was cooperative. Then the defendant intervened and he had, I believe, two telephone conversations with her that we have recordings of that were submitted to the Court in attachment to our pretrial letter that the Court's referred to already. And during those conversation, the defendant made it clear to

her that there would be adverse consequences if she continued to cooperate with the government. And in the second conversation, she reported back to him that she had been asked to come to the United States to testify at the trial and that she would not be doing so.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KULCSAR: And in that regard, Your Honor, what I would like to have presented to the Court is I offer the testimony of William LaCosta, who's prepared to testify under oath and I'd offer him now as a witness for the defendant.

MS. RYAN: This is highly irregular, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, but you see I have his actual words here in the attachment to the government's letter. And specifically, we're looking at -- let's see what the exact words are.

Where is it in your attachment?

MS. RYAN: I'm looking now, Your Honor.

(Pause.)

1.3

THE COURT: It goes for many pages. I'm just trying to find the exact location.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: Well, look, I'm looking at this thing in content. You know, at the end, she says take good care of yourself and pray a lot to God and that type of thing. So, you know, to the extent that there was this veil threat, I'm

not going to give it any credence, looking at the transcript as a whole and will not give two levels for obstruction of justice. I don't think it's explicit enough, especially in the context of the entire recording, so the adjusted offense level will be 37. Okay. I made that determination.

Now let's turn to count 1, act B. I'm going to reduce that from 39 to 37 also to be consistent with what I just did.

Anything else, Mr. Kulcsar?

MR. KULCSAR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I'm going to do the same thing with the next count. Paragraph 112 will be 37 instead of 39. The same thing in -- on paragraph 118. That becomes 37.

Now let's take a look at count 1, act B, the conspiracy to engage in sex trafficking of Jane Doe 5. We have that 16 year reference here in paragraph 121. For consistency purposes, I'm not going to apply that. So it's two levels off. And two levels off obstruction of justice. So that bring us down to 37 as well.

Next one, count 1, act F, the adjusted offense level will be 37, since I'm striking out once again the obstruction of justice. Those will be consistently struck.

So then turn to page 27. The -- there's no obstruction of justice. It's 37 again.

And in respect to count 1, act H, there will be two changes. One will be paragraph 140, the permanent scarring.

And, you know, I'm making determinations consistent with what I previously have ruled without having to, you know, repeat everything.

MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor, I -- the government understood that.

THE COURT: All right, and so there's no obstruction of justice, so that's a 37 as well.

And now count 1, act 1 respect to Jane Doe, we just eliminated the obstruction of justice, so that's 31.

And count 7, transportation for purposes of prostitution of Jane Doe 1, the change there will be the obstruction of justice, so that will be 39. The reason why it's not 37 is because of where you get the two level enhancement under 2H4.1(b)(4)(d).

MS. RYAN: That's correct.

THE COURT: Count 8, the transportation for purposes of prostitution of Jane Doe 2, paragraph 160, we're eliminating two levels there for consistency purposes, as well as the obstruction of justice. So that comes out to 37.

Count 9 will --

MS. RYAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I may have misunderstood you on the count 8 calculation.

THE COURT: Well, count 8 -- oh, I made a mistake

```
114
 1
               The specific offense characteristic under
 2
        2H4.1(b)(4)(b) remains.
 3
                  MS. RYAN: Correct. Okay.
                  THE COURT: But what does not remain is the
 4
        adjustment for obstruction of justice. So we'll be left with
 5
        39, correct?
 6
 7
                  MS. RYAN: Thirty-nine, yes.
                  THE COURT: Sorry. And then on count 9, it's 39
 8
 9
        also, correct?
10
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
                  THE COURT: And count 10 will be 39. And then
11
12
        count 15, the obstruction of justice once again, that will
13
        reduce it to 37. And then count 15, act B, once again is 37.
14
        Count 15, act C is once again 37.
15
                  I think it's understood that we really are
16
        incorporating much of what we said in the sentence of
17
        Gerardo, so --
18
                  MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor.
19
                  THE COURT: -- you know, that should be deemed to
        be incorporated by reference in all relevant respects.
20
21
                  Now count 15, act D is 37. Once again, when I say
22
        37, invariably I'm eliminating the adjustment for obstruction
23
        of justice.
24
                  Count 15, act E will be 37 because we're
25
        eliminating obstruction, as well as the victim being less
```

```
115
        than 16.
 1
 2
                  Count 15, act F will be 37.
 3
                  Count 15, act G will be 37.
 4
                  And count 15, act H will be 37 because we're
        eliminating the scarring and the obstruction of justice.
 5
                  And then the alien smuggling and alien smuggling
 6
 7
        for financial gain will be a 21 adjusted level, since we're
        once again eliminating obstruction of justice.
 8
 9
                  And then we deal with the multiple count
        adjustment. So let's see what we have here.
10
                  Which are the two 39's that remain?
11
12
                  MS. RYAN: Those were counts 7, 8, 9 and 10 are the
        level 39's. But I think based on the grouping, Your Honor,
1.3
14
        we're going to end up with the same -- at least as far as the
15
        units goes, the same --
16
                  THE COURT: You wanted the same --
                  MS. RYAN: -- combined levels.
17
18
                  THE COURT: You wanted the same eight and a half.
19
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
20
                  THE COURT: There's no change in that. Unless --
21
                  MS. RYAN: There's no change in that.
22
                  THE COURT: Unless we inadvertently slipped up on
23
        something.
24
                  So the units will reflect the adjustments which we
25
        made to the adjusted offense level and the total number of
```

units will still be eight and a half. That does work out that way, I believe.

The highest count is 36, right?

MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Less the max of five for the multiple counts. That gives us 44 and as the combined adjusted offense level. Am I missing anything? I don't think so. 44 -- what's the other one for his brother?

MS. RYAN: 42.

THE COURT: The difference being --

MS. RYAN: I think we may actually be at a 42 in this case. I'm not certain, Your Honor, I'll have to look at it again. But I think because of the way the counts are grouped, I believe Level 39's that we had for Count 7, 8, 9 and 10 were also level 39's in Gerardo Flores Carreto's revised presentence report, but because of the way they're grouped in with the other counts, the adjusted level is the 37, not the 39.

THE COURT: What is our calculation here? The top count is 39. The top count for Gerardo is --

MS. RYAN: It was, Your Honor, but I think because of the way they're grouped together it's my understanding when I went through this more carefully before we came here today, that even with the -- because there were more 37's in the group than 39, it grouped to a 37.

```
117
 1
                  THE COURT: I don't think so.
 2
                  MS. RYAN: Okay. I could be wrong.
 3
                  THE COURT: I don't see any different here between
 4
        Gerardo's and -- it's so easy to slip up here, it's so
        complicated.
 5
                  MS. RYAN: It is.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: All right. Let me see Gerardo again,
 8
        Mr. -- do you have it here?
 9
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I'm looking at page 49 of
        Gerardo Flores Perez' presentence report.
10
                  THE COURT: We said the greater -- there was no 39.
11
12
                  MS. RYAN: I believe that Count 7 in his
        calculation as well was also a 39. I may be --
13
14
                  THE COURT: We made a mistake then. We made a
15
        mistake then. I have nothing but 37's. There was Count 10 is
        a 39. We made a mistake. It's as simple as that.
16
17
                  So you know what I'm going to do here -- well, yes,
18
        if you look in Gerardo on Count 10, it gives a 39.
19
                  MS. RYAN: I think as Count 7, 8 and 9, Your Honor,
        because the two-level enhancement comes from the other
20
21
        felonies enhancement, which we discussed during that
22
        sentencing.
23
                  THE COURT: Just one second.
24
             (Pause.)
25
                  THE COURT: Yes, you're right. Count 9 is 39.
```

118 1 MS. RYAN: And we all agreed on that at the time. THE COURT: It's painfully apparent to the Court 2 3 that we made a mistake in finding that the highest level for 4 multiple count purposes was 37. It should have been 39. 5 Now, that's a mistake that the Court made in Gerardo. It's as simple as that. 6 7 And I guess the government can appeal because the 8 Court made that mistake, but I suspect the government's not 9 going to do that. 10 It would be easier for purposes of not having a disparity between similarly situated defendants for you all 11 12 to agree that the defendant will get the benefit of a mistake I made with respect to his brother's calculation and will 13 14 deem the combined adjusted offense level to be 42 here, just 15 like his brother, otherwise we'll have a sentencing 16 despaired. And I think we want to avoid that. Does that make sense, Ms. Ryan? 17 18 MS. RYAN: Yes, it does, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Okay. So we'll deem it 42 and this 20 defendant gets the benefit of the mistake we made and his 21 brother suffers. 22 So with 42 and a criminal history category of one, 23 we still have 60 to life as the advisory guideline range. All right. Mr. Kulscar, we're all grown up's here. 24

25

sentence Josue differently than his brother. We're concerned about not having disparities amongst similarly situated defendants, and this seems to be the situation.

MR. KULSCAR: At this point, Your Honor, we've resolved the issue of acceptance with respect from my client. I'd like to raise one point I don't think was fully considered, with all due respect to the Court.

Your Honor --

THE COURT: Just one second. I'm treating the adjusted offense level at 37 and with five increase for the multiple count, that's 42.

I'm not giving him any acceptance of responsibility because -- for the same reasons that I did not give his brother acceptance of responsibility, this defendant also wants to withdraw his guilty plea and we've been through that before and that doesn't sound like acceptance of responsibility to me.

MR. KULCSAR: I think that's because you may not have considered what I'd like to present to Your Honor -- as I was saying actually, watching you do all those numbers, it flashed through my mind how The Bible might have been changed if Solomon had the guideline before him when he had to make a decision on his motherhood of a trial.

THE COURT: I agree with that, but you see the supreme court in its wisdom has given district court judges

very important flexibility and has imposed a -- or created a standard of reasonableness and that takes away the sting of the guidelines. It should be perfectly apparent that I'm not really wedded by the guidelines here.

MR. KULSCAR: (Indiscernible) left to the discretion of the judges. Let me just address the exceptions issue.

My reading of the transcript of the plea, since I read it long after the event and wasn't there at the time, one thing that struck me was the Court's apparent concern about the fact that on the eve of -- after a jury had been selected, as I understand it, the defendants were going to plead guilty to all of the charges.

My understanding is that for some time before that day, there had been many discussions about a plea and my understanding of it is that the problem wasn't -- the government was insisting on a global plea.

My client was willing to enter a plea but was precluded from doing so by the fact it was not a global plea. He wasn't able to enter the plea that had been offered by the government, which as I understand it, was significantly, very significantly, less than what they now confront.

So I think that having that background, the defendant's desire to withdraw the plea is partly, I think, based on the fact that as part of the plea he didn't allocute

```
just for the crime for which he was charged. He was required to allocute for a lot of the things that are now part of the sentencing enhancements, and I think that that's a large portion of the problem that he has with respect to going forward with the guidelines calculations as they are.
```

And I think part of that is based on the fact that this Court has heard perjured testimony from one victim.

Perjured testimony.

MS. RYAN: I object to that, Your Honor.

MR. KUSCAR: Testimony in front of you that was a lie, as I understand it -- one of the victims, Olivia, as I understand it (indiscernible) and testified under oath and part of what I understand she said was untruthful.

But other --

THE COURT: I don't know what part was untruthful.

MR. KUSCAR: I'm offering Mr. LaCosta again as witness under oath. He also has videos which I'm offering -- willing to offer into evidence at the sentencing hearing, and the second victim.

THE COURT: Do you want to have some sort of a hearing?

MR. KULCSAR: Well, I don't know -- yes. I mean, for the extent that --

THE COURT: A hearing on what issue?

MR. KULCSAR: An issue as to the victim's -- one

1.3

victim's truthfulness and the fact that another victim came before Your Honor and refused to testify under oath and I believe the reason for that is because of what was presented in the presentence report is not truthful.

And I think that clearly, Your Honor in sentencing the co-defendant was -- I can only imagine affected by what's in the presentence report and by what you heard in person today.

My problem is I don't have any personal relationship with this defendant. A lot of clients you represent after a long period of time you develop a certain closeness to.

But my concern is that I was mentored in the Manhattan D.A.'s Office under Frank Hogan and our responsibility, as I always understood it, was if at the last minute something was presented to us that we should consider in any way that impacted on guilt, innocence or sentencing, we were taught that we should look at it and make sure that we're doing the right thing.

I haven't seen any of the things that Ms. LaCosta apparently has brought.

THE COURT: The problem I have here is that I have your client who pled guilty to 27 crimes. I painstakingly went over his rights, made sure that there was a proper allocution and he allocuted to significant criminal behavior.

Now listen to me. Okay?

And I take these types of pleas under oath when I have spent an enormous amount of time making sure that the defendant is satisfied with his lawyering, understands he can't withdraw the guilty plea and allocutes to 27 crimes.

When then somebody comes here at the veritable moment of sentencing with some Spanish document which is not even translated and thrusts this upon the Court after this matter has been adjourned a number of times and now is going to use that as the peg for all sorts of applications that would undoubtedly be forthcoming, 2255's, whatever, that's an enormous imposition on the Court.

I don't disagree with you that if anything has come to the Court's attention prior to sentencing that I should consider it and I would consider it.

But this is the basis for the application to withdraw his guilty pleas. The defendant has all the knowledge in the world that was necessary for him to decide whether or not to plead guilty. We had the jurors ready to be selected. Did we actually select the jurors?

MS. RYAN: We did, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We selected the jury and we were ready to go. And I asked the defendants why don't you want to go to trial and they said well, you know, I guess because they felt

it would be in their best interest to accept responsibility. There was some reference made that this would be one fact that they would get the benefit of acceptance of responsibility and I was prepared to give them the benefit of that, until what happened today.

Now, we don't even know what's in that document.

You thrust it at the Court here in some sort of a veiled effort, you know, to sort of get a further adjournment here.

It just comes with a lot of baggage to it. All right.

And the best that I can glean from giving our Spanish speaking colleague, Senor Musa-obregon, an opportunity to tell me what's in it is that it relates to somewhat three victims having said something in some court proceeding in Mexico, but I'm dealing with nine victims here; not three victims. And I'm dealing with a guilty plea. And your clients know all the facts that were necessary to know, including what goes on and what doesn't go on in Mexico, who these people were.

If they really believed that these women were not being candid, that there was no basis for the government's charges, they had the opportunity to say not guilty, rather than guilty.

That's why I look upon this with sort of -- not in a naive way as a judge on the eve of sentencing.

So I thought I would owe you the courtesy of that

explanation. And there may be other good reasons that upon reflection by higher authorities they could think of why I should not allow yet a further continuance and allow testimony about all of this. But this is the best that I can do on the spot.

But once again, he pled guilty to 27 counts and at best, maybe two or three of those were Jane Doe's who he now claims said something down in Mexico that you think, you know, justifies aborting these proceedings and having continued adjournments and taking testimony -- I just don't think looking at this thing in balance that it's unfair to your client to turn thumbs down on that.

That doesn't mean you can't talk to me about it, but I'm not going to take testimony about what may or may not have happened in Mexico under all these circumstances in respect to three out of at least nine victims. Okay? So what else do you wish to say?

MR. KULCSAR: Well, Your Honor, my purpose was not to undermine the integrity of a plea or the allocution that was taken by the Court.

THE COURT: I interrupt -- my apologies, to add one thing else. And certainly, you can interrupt me, too, as thoughts pop up into our heads.

But he wasn't asking, nor were the other defendants asking to withdraw their guilty plea in respect to three

```
1
        victims. He wanted me to throw out his quilty plea with
        respect to everybody. That's simply not -- it's the
 2
 3
        antithesis of the acceptance of responsibility.
                  MR. KULCSAR: Well, I don't know to what extent
 4
        information that was presently available might have any
 5
        affect on the Court in imposing a sentence. I don't know
 6
 7
        because Your Honor hasn't heard it and --
 8
                  THE COURT: I know that and if, in fact, a higher
 9
        authority thinks I should have adjourned the matter, given
        you an opportunity to get a translation of that and take into
10
        consideration on the issue of whether the plea should be
11
12
        withdrawn --
1.3
                  MR. KULCSAR: May I have one second? I want to
14
        ask --
15
                  THE COURT: Then I'll have to do it. But I just
16
        don't feel that that's the right thing to do here now.
17
                  MR. KULCSAR: May I have one moment, Your Honor?
18
             (Pause.)
19
                  MR. KULCSAR: One moment. I apologize?
20
                  THE COURT: Yes, go ahead. Take your time.
21
             (Pause.)
22
                  THE COURT: Ms. Ryan?
23
                  MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor.
24
                  THE COURT: You know, the issue that has been
25
        framed here, that you're going to have to possibly argue in
```

the Court of Appeals. I just wanted to make a clear record of where we're at. And I don't mean to preclude you.

If you suggest to the Court that there should be an adjournment under all of these circumstances, you can do so.

I'm not hearing that recommendation from you, but I don't want you to feel as if I'm forcing the government into an intolerable position here.

MS. RYAN: Certainly not, Your Honor. The government's in complete agreement with the Court's rationale as to why an adjournment at this point would be inappropriate.

THE COURT: All right. I just want you to know that you have this option here.

MS. RYAN: Thank you very much, Judge.

MR. KULCSAR: Thank you, Your Honor. I understand, for example, just by way of proffer that Ms. LaCosta has videotaped interviews of the mother of Veronica, one of the persons that came before Your Honor and made a (indiscernible) statement. That woman is the person that -- according to what I understand is in the transcripts, precipitated the investigations in the trials in Mexico for which the defendants were found not guilty.

Presumably, those documents also demonstrate the fact that Veronica -- withdrawn. The mother of Veronica was involved with a group of persons that kidnaped the brother of

1.3

my client and held him for ransom -- I believe there's
reference in the --

THE COURT: There's also some allegations and claims that have been going on forever. I'm sure of that. There'll be new allegations next month and next year.

MR. KUSCAR: The videotape itself is of very recent vintage. And I believe the fact of the matter is that there is a whole undercurrent for this case.

 $$\operatorname{My}$ client has admitted guilt for those things that he has done. I think that --

THE COURT: Look what he's allocuted to. I thought I made it clear before I'm going to sentence him based upon the crimes he allocuted to. That's what I'm going to be sentencing him, based upon that. The nature of those crimes, his circumstances, his personal characteristics, the need for deterrents and all those other factors. That's all I'm going to be doing.

The victim's statements I listen to because they would like to be heard. But his sentence is not going to be based upon the victim's statements and I don't think I've said I've even considered that.

I mean, the time that I think is warranted here in respect to his brother is based upon the comments which I made on the record and I think they all relate to 3553 and I think I expressed myself as clearly as I'm capable of doing

so.

So rest assured that my decision is not based upon any factors or circumstances that are not part of the record.

MR. KULCSAR: I would respectfully suggest one, to the extent that the guidelines are advisory and to the extent that Your Honor has a great deal of latitude, obviously in passing sentence, that the imposition of a sentence beyond the Level 41, which was originally anticipated, is not a reasonable sentence under law in the facts of the case.

THE COURT: You can argue that in the Circuit Court of Appeals that there's no question that Judge Block has looked upon these crimes are horrendous crimes. There's no question that I see a need for deterrents and to send a message and a powerful message because of the nature of these crimes and everything that flows from that.

And you can argue that it was not a reasonable sentence -- that 50 years for his brother, who may be here as well, though I'm not going to sentencing until I hear from everybody -- you can say that it was not reasonable. You can do that.

And this is one judge's view of it and I just have a very dim view of this case. So you know the record is clear. Go ahead. Anything else?

MR. KULCSAR: Well, I understand that this is one judge's view of it and I guess it's hard considering that I

```
1
        spent many years prosecuting and trying murder cases and saw
        defendants who committed multiple murders getting 25 or 30
 2
 3
        years to life, which is still the standard in the state; that
 4
        the sentence that this Court imposed on the co-defendant --
                  THE COURT: Because nobody was killed, right?
 5
                  MR. KULCSAR: I'm sorry?
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Because nobody was killed? I
 8
        understand what you're saying. I mean, I've imposed sentences
 9
        where there have been deaths involved that were significantly
10
        less than what I'm doing here. I don't think my reputation
        is one of being the toughest sentencer on the bench.
11
12
                  But in this particular case, the violation of women
13
        in this case, their whole modus operandi, the nature of the
14
        crimes, their insensitivity to humankind -- I know that
15
        nobody was killed, fortunately. But I still think that this
16
        type of punishment was warranted.
17
                                 Well, okay, Your Honor. I know Your
                  MR. KULCSAR:
18
        Honor's view is based on what you read in the presentence
19
        report and, obviously --
20
                  THE COURT: Not just based on --
21
                  MR. KULCSAR: Sorry?
22
                  THE COURT: You keep saying that it's based upon my
23
        sitting here while they pled guilty after a jury was selected
24
        to 27 heinous crimes and just treating women like garbage.
```

They pled guilty to that. I'm not making this up. I just --

25

maybe I'm a male chauvinist pig, you know. I don't know. But it bothers me terribly that people should be so inhumane to their fellow human beings.

MR. KULCSAR: I wasn't -- I certainly don't mean to suggest that the Court shouldn't be bothered or upset, or distressed by any of the allegations and the defendant's plea. I was distressed myself.

But what I'm respectfully suggesting, Your Honor, is that a sentence of -- and the range that you sentenced the co-defendant to --

THE COURT: Is very severe.

MR. KULCSAR: -- is far in excess of what I think is a fair and appropriate and reasonable.

THE COURT: I understand. I understand where you're coming from. I understand that and I respect that. And this is just the way I see it.

I mean, it's -- judges are accused of playing God. We take these things very seriously. I think it should be very apparent how seriously I've taken this matter from the beginning. And that's why we have appellate courts. Maybe you'll be able to make the same arguments there and you can argue reasonableness.

MR. KULCSAR: I've never taken that view though.

I've never -- I guess since I've been a trial lawyer all my

life, I've never taken the view that we have a appellate

courts for that reason.

THE COURT: I think it's important for the appellate court to sit in judgement of what I've done here. I think that's part of our process and I would feel badly if that process did not unfold because I would feel more comfortable having judges on the Court of Appeals who are more learned than I am and more intelligent than I am review what I did in a case of this nature. And I hope that happens.

MR. KULCSAR: I really -- I don't want to have a philosophical -- to say it was wrong. I would just suggest that if I were where this prosecutor was and all the years I stood there and someone said look at something and I'd like to have an adjournment because I think it's significant and should be considered, I wouldn't object to that. I never did. And maybe that's because I was mentored when Mr. Hogan and then Mr. Morgenthal mentored Ms. Ryan's boss.

But in addition to that, Your Honor, I have nothing to add. I think Your Honor --

THE COURT: You've got a record and maybe the higher authorities would say under the circumstances I shouldn't have given you the adjournment. They know. It's not an unreasonable argument.

I just -- not at this time and not under all these circumstances and all for the reasons which I've explained

```
133
 1
        where I think it's appropriate here.
 2
                  You see, it's not as if you come up with some
 3
        proffer here and gave it to me yesterday even. It's not as if
        you're telling me something that would really significantly
 4
        impact the guilty pleas. You're just talking about three
 5
        people down in Mexico who apparently said something different
 6
 7
        there and I respect that.
 8
                  There's guilty pleas. They know what they did.
 9
        They were in full command of all the knowledge that they
10
        needed before they pled quilty.
                  Anyway, I respect your arguments. Does the
11
12
        government want to respond at all?
13
                  MS. RYAN: No, I don't think so, Your Honor. I
        would ask the Court's indulgence for me just to make sure
14
15
        that none of the victims wanted to speak.
                  THE COURT: Go ahead.
16
17
             (Pause.)
18
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, one of the victims has
19
        something she'd like to add.
20
                  THE COURT: This young lady was here before. Tell
21
        us your name again.
22
```

MS. ROMERO: Veronica Romero.

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Now, you testified under oath -- not testified. You spoke under oath before, if I recall correctly, right?

MS. RYAN: I don't believe she did.

THE COURT: Oh, you did not. For some reason you didn't want to do that. So you have the right to make a statement. Go ahead.

MR. KULCSAR: Excuse me, Your Honor. I would ask for her take an oath.

THE COURT: No, I don't have to do that. It's not required.

MR. KULCSAR: I'm just asking if you would. The others did.

THE COURT: No, no. I gave them the option and I should not necessarily have even put them in that position. They don't have to speak under oath. There's nothing in the law that requires that. I just wanted to give them that option and -- for whatever reason. But she doesn't want to do that. Go ahead.

MS. ROMERO: I just heard that it is not appropriate that they be sentenced to the number of years that they were sentenced because they did not kill anybody.

But as far as I am concerned, it is a death. When I was pregnant, five months pregnant, when Josue arrived in New York he caused me to abort and as far as I'm concerned it was a killing that was not deserved for a human being to be killed in that way.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else you wish to

```
135
 1
        say?
 2
                  MS. ROMERO: No.
 3
                  THE COURT: All right. Fine. Anybody else wish to
 4
        speak?
 5
                  MS. RYAN: Not on this defendant, Your Honor.
             (Pause.)
 6
 7
                  MS. RYAN: I may have spoken too quickly.
 8
                  THE COURT: Yes. Your name again.
 9
                  MS. CRUZ: My name is Maria Derayo Garcia Cruz.
10
                  THE COURT: Now, you did speak before with respect
        to Gerardo, correct? And if I recall, you chose to speak
11
12
        under oath.
1.3
                  MS. CRUZ: Yes.
14
                  THE COURT: And so I assume you still are doing
15
        this under oath, correct?
16
                  MS. CRUZ: Yes.
17
                  THE COURT: So what is it that you wish to tell me
18
        about this defendant, Josue?
19
                  MS. CRUZ: It's only a message. Just an
        evaluation as to the fact that this man does not value women.
20
21
        It's not just these women who are here. There are more women
22
        that this man has mistreated, that he has -- whose lives have
23
        been destroyed for both the women and their families.
24
        it.
25
                  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Anybody
```

else?

MS. RYAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Josue Flores Carreto, of course, you're here. You know what I said in respect to your brother but nonetheless, sentences are all individual and I don't automatically sentence everybody the same way so I'm very much concerned about your particular circumstances and what, if anything, you wish to say to me before sentence is imposed.

DEFENDANT JOSUE CARETTO: First of all, good afternoon. Inasmuch as the victims are here and I see the lady who is here, why doesn't she mention her husband. His name is Aliou (ph).

So why is she referring to me? She's never lived with me. She's never known anything about my life. Why is she putting me in this conspiracy?

I'm being put in it since '91 to this date. And between '91 and '96 I didn't even have a wife. I was in a group of Alcoholics Anonymous and I even have proof of that.

In '96 I got together with Minerva Calderone. I got married to her and I haven't had any problems with her. I continued talking to her by phone and talking to her mom.

Now, Ms. Veronica is complaining and she's saying that perhaps I harmed her. But why doesn't she say that it as she who was looking me up. When I was in Tijuana, she was

always calling me up by phone.

Her friends from where she worked. I have their testimony. They went to Mexico recently. And what I'm seeing is that we're being judged for the most minimal things that we did, but the proofs that we have otherwise -- don't want to hear them.

everything but for you to characterize that you're being judged on the minimal things that you did sounds to the Court to be just bizarre in the face of your pleading guilty to 27 serious crimes involving multiple, multiple victims and where you acknowledged that you caused physical harm to these people, as well as sex trafficking for the purposes of prostitution and everything else you pled guilty to.

And when you speak like this, it doesn't seem as if you're accepting the fact that you did confess to many crimes of the most serious nature here and you seem to want to diminish them and you had all the knowledge in the world before you pled guilty of your acts and your so-called wife and your situations that you speak about. And nonetheless, you pled guilty to all these crimes.

You had every opportunity to go to trial and put forward a defense. You did not do that. You pled guilty. What else do you have to say?

DEFENDANT JOSUE CARETTO: How could have I

presented any defense? The attorney I had didn't even have any proof to be able to present them in my trial.

I wasn't going to go to a trial with nothing. And Veronica herself, when my brother was kidnaped, she helped them go and find and arrest the people who had kidnaped him. Yes, she was working in Puerla. She was working in prostitution, but she called us by phone and she said look, they're here in Puerla. Come pick them up.

And she knows that nobody was made to do anything by force here. Whatever was done was because they wanted it.

THE COURT: Well, that's not what you pled guilty to. Okay. I just find it so disingenuous for everybody to speak in terms of the fact that they're innocent of these charges, when they pled guilt to all 27 counts, including physical violence and everything else that went along with it.

I can read you back your own words, if you forgot what they were. What else?

DEFENDANT JOSUE CARETTO: Yes, I understand what you're saying, but then why -- now she's saying she's a victim. But when I would go to Chinagua, I would go pick her up and we would go and we went swimming. All of her friends knew that there was no force involved there.

THE COURT: But there are many other victims that you pled guilty to. Even if I were to credit everything you

say about Veronica, what explains the seven or eight other people here that you said you physically abused that you pled guilty to and you admitted being an organizer of the group of people involved here in sex trafficking, et cetera, et cetera and that you just don't want to talk about that. You just want to focus on the one person who spoke today.

I'm not necessarily going to sentence you because of that. I'm taking everything into consideration, including the way you speak to me and what you're saying. I'm giving you all the opportunities to speak. If you wish to say anything more, you can do so. You let me know.

DEFENDANT JOSUE CARETTO: But in any case, if I behaved so badly with the other girls, why is it that they allow me still to go into their houses, that they talk to me?

There are no victims. The only ones I can see are Minerva and Maricella Hernandez.

THE COURT: Anything else?

DEFENDANT JOSUE CARETTO: That's why I don't agree with the sentence and I would ask that you be fair with me. I don't feel that that's what's happening. This is abuse.

THE COURT: Okay. The sentence the Court will issue where will be the same as in Gerardo's situation. I want to avoid sentencing disparity, in addition to the fact that I considered the 3553 factors here to be of the same import as with the brother. They're tied together. They're

both organizers, joint organizers of this horrible criminal activity.

And once again, considering 3553(a) and all of the other aspects of 3553(a), I call attention to the horrific nature and circumstances of these 27 offenses. I don't see anything in the history and characteristics of the defendant that is terribly redeeming.

I think that, as I mentioned before, there's a terrible need here for a serious punishment to reflect the seriousness of the offense to promote respect for the law, as well as to provide just punishment and also to afford adequate deterrents and to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant.

Hopefully, this sentence will go a long way towards deterring others who may believe that they can engage in sex trafficking and all the types of things that are represented in this particular prosecution. I hope it has a chilling effect upon others, because these issues are serious.

The Congress of the United States has passed specific legislation, has made findings identifying the types of problems that these activities represent and the Court agrees that it should do -- make a statement consistent with Congressional concerns that we have to stop this type of things in its tracks and I think that this prosecution, even though it's going to result in a long period of incarceration

for these defendants, and justifiably so, will also serve the additional salutary purpose of deterrents and protection of the public.

So that will be Counts 2 through 6. 50 years on each count. They'll be concurrent, together with five years of supervised release with the special condition that the defendant was deported and reentered the United States illegally.

Counts 1 and 7 through 27 will carry five years of incarceration concurrent to each other, as well, as to the counts 2 through 6. There will be three years of supervised release that will be concurrent with the five years of supervised release. A \$2,700 special assessment, which reflects \$100 for each crime. The fact that it's \$2,700 reinforces the seriousness of this criminal behavior. I don't think the Court has ever sat in judgement of defendants who have affected 27 crimes before.

I should add also the fact that the adjusted -the multiple adjustment was capped at five, just because
that's the statutory basis.

But you know, substantively, the large number of these crimes that were committed, you know, would warrant some consideration for the fact that the -- if not for the cap the eight and a half levels would be indicated. I'm not punishing you for that. I'm just reflecting that the

multiplicity of the counts here I think adds to the Court's sense of the seriousness of the criminal conduct.

There are general conditions of supervised release, which is being handed to you in Spanish by the Court's clerk. I'm not going to fine you. You don't have the ability to pay a fine.

And last, you have absolute rights to appeal. My hope is that you will do so, because a matter of this seriousness where the Court has imposed a very harsh sentence, it would do the court some comfort to have three judges on a higher level review these proceedings, considering the importance of everything we've been speaking about and, of course, once again, the harsh sentence, which I consider to be reasonable under all of the circumstances.

And I think that that concludes the Court's sentence here. If you wish to exercise your right to appeal, you can make application for the appointment of counsel, if you cannot afford counsel and you would protect your rights to appeal by filing a notice of appeal within ten days after written judgement is entered protecting you within 30 days thereafter, unless you get some extension of time, which undoubtedly you will be able to get, I suspect, from the higher court that will be processing the appeal.

I think that concludes the sentence. Mr. Kulscar,

I want to thank you for your comments. They were well taken

```
143
 1
        and well spoken. This is why sentencing is so difficult.
 2
                  THE COURT: Anything else?
 3
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I just wanted to put on the
 4
        record --
 5
                  THE COURT: Just one second. Restitution again?
                  MS. RYAN: Well, yes. First the restitution again.
 6
 7
        The government -- we can figure out a way to calculate it --
 8
                  THE COURT: Well, you just think about that
 9
        carefully, because we've had a long sentencing and you may be
10
        within your legal right, but sometimes you look at the
        practical aspects of sentencing, as well as the strict letter
11
12
        of the law.
1.3
                  If you think there's something so compelling, then
        I'll give you your right to pursue your legal remedies, but
14
15
        at the same time, I would just ask you to think heavily about
16
        that before we come back to court again.
17
                  That concludes the sentence --
18
                  MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I'm sorry. There is one
19
        other thing I wanted to put on the record.
20
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, my client was not able to be
21
        here, so --
22
                  THE COURT: Well, we're not dealing with his
23
        sentence right now. We will shortly. Go ahead.
24
                  MS. RYAN: I just wanted to indicate, Your Honor,
```

that you may remember much earlier in the case the Court

25

signed a no contact order between the defendants and the victims in this case.

THE COURT: Just one second.

1.3

Mr. Hochbaum, if there's something we have to attend to, let me know. Is there a problem? Maybe I could help everybody.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, I'm getting directions from marshals as to how I should deal with the Court. I don't think it's appropriate for them to tell me how to deal with my client. Within the confines of that absolutely. That's their job.

THE COURT: Let's just try to move on with the heavy business at hand. If there's something you feel that you want to bring to my attention as an officer of the court and as a respected attorney, I'll certainly hear you out.

Let me just finish with this first.

MS. RYAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. RYAN: There was a no contact order that was authorized by the Court much earlier in this case prohibiting the defendants from contacting the victims in this case.

We would just ask that that order -- that the defense be reminded that order is still in effect and that applies to both direct and indirect contact.

THE COURT: Is that a condition of -- well, we're

not dealing with supervised release. I don't have any specific recollection of the tentacles to whatever I said before as to each -- I'm not going to do it now. It's now ten to 5:00. It's been a long day.

If there's any problems, you'll let me know and we can deal with it and the Bureau of Prisons is going to take control over his behavior now, too.

So I don't see that there's any need for me to say anything about that here today. Let's take five minutes and then we'll deal with Mr. Hochbaum's client.

(Recess from 4:46 p.m. until 4:49 p.m.)

THE COURT: Let's go. It's five to 5:00. It's been a long day but let's see wehther we can complete all of this today if it's possible to do so.

Any problem ehre?

MS. RYAN: We're having a slight problem with the interpreter, Your Honor. There's only here right now and there's been during the course of the day a second interpreter who's been interpreting into the headphones.

With the Court's permission, Ms. Clancy is happy to sub in until the court interpreter --

THE COURT: Who would be?

MS. RYAN: Libia Clancy, the Spanish interpreter who was being used when the victims were speaking to the Court. It's just so that the victims can hear --

```
146
 1
                  THE COURT: There's no reason why we should not do
 2
        that, is there?
 3
                  MS. RYAN: I don't think so, Your Honor. No, Your
 4
        Honor.
 5
                  THE COURT: I mean, we've spoke about Ms. Clancy
        before. I think she can come in and help us under the
 6
 7
        circumstances.
 8
                  MS. RYAN: Thank you.
 9
                  THE COURT: And also, Senor Musa-obregon was kind
        enough to act as officer of the court to tell me if there's
10
        any problem, but he didn't say anything at all. So it
11
12
        verifies the fact that she's doing just a perfect job.
1.3
                  MS. RYAN: That's my recollection as well. Thank
14
        you.
15
                  THE COURT: Mr. Hochbaum, your client is now in a
16
        better position --
17
                  THE INTERPRETER: Excuse me, Your Honor. May we
18
        please check out this equipment?
19
                  THE COURT: I don't know how to help you
20
        technically.
21
             (Pause.)
22
                  MS. RYAN: It's working. Thank you, Judge.
23
                  THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hochbaum, I know it's
24
        been a long, arduous day and your client is in somewhat of a
25
        different position because he's not being characterized as an
```

organizer, just as a manager and it seems that his role, his involvement is somewhat less than the Caretta brothers.

So with that overture, let me ask you is there anything that remains before we proceed to sentence your client?

MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, Judge, in what has gone on previously with the Court's denial of the acceptance points because of the motion made, I think my client stands in a different position with regard to that than with regard to the other defendants. He certainly signed the motion, Judge, and he certainly made it with full knowledge.

However, the situation is substantially different to him and it deals specifically with the nature of his relationship with his prior lawyer and what was explained to him.

And one of the problems that my client has is, as the Court will note, his birthdate is in 1979. This conspiracy for which he pled guilty to commenced in 1991. Subsequently, upon reading the Probation Department's report, he discovers, as did I, that with regard to one of the victims who is alleged to have been forced into servitude when she was under the age of 16, at the time that that occurred, my client was 12.

I believe that part of the reason why he joined in the motion to withdraw his plea is he felt that he was not

sufficiently advised by his prior attorney with regard to the consequences of admitting involvement in a conspiracy from 1991 on; that he would then subsequently get enhancements for conduct which he was neither part of the conspiracy -- was not a member of the conspiracy and certainly was probably physically incapable of participating in.

My conversations with him with regard to his acceptance of responsibility is that he understands that he pled guilty and he accepts his responsibility. I don't believe the existence of a pro forma technical motion to withdraw a plea would preclude the Court from giving him acceptance points.

There is an additional factor which I learned today, which has not been put on the record. During the substantial efforts, and I understand them to be very good hearted efforts and well meaning efforts by the prosecution to convince the defendants to plead guilty, and evidently, they were invited into the discussions by the defense attorneys, there was a suggestion but the former head of the parole division that the clients would be allowed to proffer for cooperation purposes after the entry of their plea.

Subsequent to the taking of the plea, a letter was sent by Mr. Alonzo indicating that that would not go forward.

I'm hearing this secondhand. I see Ms. Ryan shaking her head, so I'm suggesting that this is information that I

received, although I cannot tell you the truth of the matter.

I can tell you, however, Judge, that my client has accepted responsibility and has, in fact, plead guilty to crimes at least to a certain -- if one was to look specifically at the dates of the some of the specific crimes, crimes that he could not and did not commit.

However, he has acknowledged that he has been a participant in this conspiracy. So my first request is that the Court grant him the acceptance of responsibility points.

THE COURT: Ms. Ryan, I see him in somewhat of a different posture than the other defendants, but I want to give the government an opportunity. I'm open to those suggestions of Mr. Hochbaum. There seems to be some sort of basis for looking upon him a little differently than the Caretta brothers, but I want to hear from the government.

He wanted to accept responsibility. He had Mr.

Lashley. We have a history here. We went back and forth

over this -- I don't want to burden the record further, but

it seems that he's been a little bit more amenable, perhaps,

to cooperating. Do I have it wrong? I mean, you tell me.

MS. RYAN: I don't know about cooperating, Your
Honor. I understand the Court's reference to the problems
that the defendant raised with the Court regarding his prior
representation. But the Court carefully asked this defendant
about those problems --

THE COURT: I did.

MS. RYAN: -- before taking the plea. And we took special care with this defendant because of that history.

THE COURT: I did.

MS. RYAN: And the defendant said that he understood that and he withdrew all of the motions he had pending.

THE COURT: He accepted responsibility. And what happened since then? You said he signed his name to the elective letter. My sense is that he wasn't the ringleader there. I don't know who was.

MS. RYAN: I don't think there's any way for us to know without inquiring into all three defendants, Your Honor. I think this is one of the mysteries of the MDC. I really don't know who suggested this motion to them, but I don't see any real difference between this defendant and the other two.

They've all sprung this on the court and the government and their own lawyers on the eve of sentencing and I submit that it may be purely for delay tactics and for nothing else. And it certainly --

THE COURT: I'm inclined to agree that this is the antithesis of the acceptance of responsibility after the painstaking efforts the Court made over long periods of time

MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge?

1.3

THE COURT: -- to assure that, you know, they understood that this plea really was going to stick and that we were treating it with that type of seriousness and purpose and you're quite right.

I took particular pains in light of the history of Mr. Lashley. I was tough with Mr. Lashley at times also and I said things to Mr. Lashley; I want to make my best efforts to make sure I will not have to deal with any corroborative matters if your client goes forward and pleads in light of the fact that he's protesting continuously about your legal representation and we went on to say having this colloquy this morning -- I'm talking to pages 12 and 13 of the plea proceedings back on April 5th, 2005 and said it would make it less probable and more probable that I have to deal with 2255 collateral attacks.

Out of the process of argument, he said you didn't properly advise him, that he wasn't being effective counsel.

I think it is important for us to engage in these prophylactic measures at this particular time and I wanted to hear from Mr. Lashley in light of the fact that his client expressed displeasure in his representation in the past.

I said that I will speak to him about that extensively and in light of the fact that now, contrary to what he said on prior occasions, he's willing to plead to the entire indictment, strikes me that we have to be very

cautious about understanding the exact events transpired -- transpired in the court.

And then we went on from that point forward and then Mr. Lashley said that he feels that in light of FanFan and Booker, he thinks his best interests would be to avoid facing the possibility of life in jail and to view with all these matters in sentencing and we go on and on from that point forward to make it clear that Mr. Alonso was satisfied with his counsel.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge?

MS. RYAN: Judge, and --

MR. HOCHBAUM: If I might? It seems to me that the focus on whether or not my client makes a motion after taking his plea to withdraw his plea -- a motion that has very little basis.

THE COURT: I'm saying it's the basis of the motion that really concerns me, you see?

MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand that, Judge. But also, it's clear in the subsection involving acceptance of responsibility that the major concern is the obviation of the need for the people to try the case. Okay? And that has happened.

THE COURT: Right. And I appreciate that. But, you know, I just want to make it clear. It's not that I'm saying that because somebody makes a motion that that

automatically withdraw his plea -- that that automatically means he is no longer a candidate for acceptance of responsibility.

It's the substance and the nature of the motion. I read through those three pages, you see? And those three pages really tell the court that he just doesn't accept responsibility. That's what I'm referring to.

And the three pages are that infamous letter, I guess we can say, jointly signed by the three defendants.

It's not just the one paragraph -- please, I've had a change of heart or my lawyer didn't properly advise me and this or that.

I know you're faced with a tough cup of tea now. But what should be clear is the substance of the reason why as he sets forth in that letter he wants to change his plea that, you know, I think motivates me to treat him the same as the other defendants by not giving him acceptance of responsibility.

And I think in fact for consistency purposes and without elaboration, I just am not going to go along with giving him acceptance of responsibility. So let's go forward--

MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, Judge, I mean if -- as long as we're making reference to the three pages, paragraph 3 of the letter says, "It is those Rule 11 errors and counsel's

ineffectiveness that formed the basis for the motion to withdraw the guilty plea and appoint new counsel."

THE COURT: Let's stop.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Okay?

THE COURT: Look at the Rule 11 errors that's eluded to. That I did not advise the defendant or defendants they have a right to testify in their own behalf. That's just wrong.

I mean, you know, it's as clear as anything that I gave that specific advice. This is the basis for his wanting to withdraw his guilty plea?

MR. HOCHBAUM: Which makes me wonder whether or not one could look at this motion --

THE COURT: And take it seriously?

MR. HOCHBAUM: -- on its face in light of the transcript that says that that's a suggestion and he doesn't accept responsibility.

Okay? It seems to me that when you plead guilty and you say it 27 times, that's a heck of a lot more forthcoming and strong evidence of your acceptance of responsibility than a, you know, two-and-a-half page letter that says --

THE COURT: The client sends me a letter that says it's absolutely -- you know, saying that the Court, you know, did not properly advise him.

MR. HOCHBAUM: But it doesn't say, Judge, in the letter that I'm not guilty. Nowhere does those words come in. Nowhere does it say I didn't do these crimes. It simply said there were procedural errors. I didn't get appropriate advice and I feel that I'm entitled, as well as this new information that seems to be exculpatory in some nature, that I'm entitled to have my plea back.

THE COURT: You've been directed. I'm not going to give him acceptance of responsibility. I don't want to burden the record any further but you simply stated -- how you made it, cogent reasons why I should reconsider that I'm inclined to do so.

Okay. Let's move on in a more structured way at this time. We had the presentence report. Let me tell you what I have in the file. And I think it should be understood that everything that I've said that's relevant in the prior sentences should be re-incorporated herein.

I just thought as an afterthought in that respect that while with Gerardo Carreto I was very explicit about why I chose that particular sentence, considering that it was 24 months in excess of the advisory range on the low level. I didn't specifically say that in respect to a sway, but I did incorporate my comments that I made and that's certainly, I hope --

MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, I will --

```
THE COURT: -- I assume is implicit, but it does
 1
 2
        not mean explicitly the same reasons why I chose the 600
 3
        months for Gerardo also of course pertain to --
 4
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, as we know --
                  THE COURT: -- let me finish so that we have a
 5
        clear record. Also pertains to Josue. But that doesn't deal
 6
 7
        with Josue. Is that how you pronounce his name?
 8
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Josue.
 9
                  THE COURT: Josue.
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Josue.
10
                  THE COURT: All right. So I made that clear.
11
12
        Let's go on and tell you what I have in my sentence file.
1.3
                  The transcript, of course, is being incorporated of
        April 5th, 2005. The government's letter of April 26th,
14
15
        2006, to the extent that it addresses your client's concerns,
16
        is -- is identified in that it will be part of the file.
17
                  The presentence report, we've referred to that, of
18
                That's dated December 15th, 2005. There's an
19
        addendum to the presentence report in this particular case
        and that deals with his exceptions to the fact that he has
20
21
        been characterized as a manager and that's dated February 9,
22
        2006.
23
                  Of course, I have what I refer to as the infamous
24
        letter of April 24th, 2006 which we just have spoken about.
25
        And the recommendation by the Probation Department. You
```

folks have it, I assume? The comments are basically the same as with the brothers -- a little different.

And the recommendation here on Counts 2 through 6 is 30 years concurrent and 7 through 27, five years concurrent with everything.

What else should I have here? Let me take a look at my -- yes. Yes. I have Mr. Hapgar's letter of April 20th, 2006 talking about guidelines sentencing matters.

I have the, of course, notice of motion to allow him to withdraw his plea and there is this declaration that has six paragraphs in it. That's dated April 24th, 2006.

And therein, amongst other things, he refers in paragraph 4 the Rule 11(b)(1)(e) which requires the Court before accepting the plea of guilty to inform the defendant of his right to testify and then Mr. Alonso is just wrong. He's saying that the court did not do that.

And also in terms of the issue of whether or not I properly inquired as to whether or not the guilty plea was one which did not have any promises associated with it in terms of sentencing or otherwise. We fleshed it out very carefully, and also another example of he just seems to want to not accept responsibility.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, Judge, in light of that, I would bring to the Court's attention this information that I was given today about some suggestions made by the former

chief of the Criminal Division to the defendants with regard to potential Rule 35 motions or later on in the process. Not being present, I don't know. I know there is a letter in the file from Mr. Alonso. That would be Gerardo Alonso, the former chief, indicating that they were not considering the subsequent cooperation of the defendants.

It appears to me that such a letter that occurs after the plea would not be necessary unless, in fact, there were some at least suggestions made prior thereto that that was something that would be considered.

Now, I don't suggest that the government promised that they would do it, nor am I suggesting that Mr. Alonso did not have the full power to say to them, we'll take that under consideration and make a determination --

THE COURT: Let me just finish.

MR. HOCHBAUM: -- which, I'm sure, is what he did.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HOCHBAUM: However, when my defendant, who's fairly uneducated, has problems with his lawyers and deals in another language, then presents a motion which indicates whether or not -- or questions whether or not -- promises were made, it seems to me that the court should not take the pro forma approach that since he wants to withdraw his plea, he shouldn't get acceptance of responsibility.

Certainly, the acceptance of responsibility statute

1.3

or guideline contemplates defendants getting acceptance of responsibility after trial.

THE COURT: But there's more than that in the declaration and there's more than that in the three- or fourpage letter. I don't want to go over it any further. It's just the totality of all these factors and circumstances which I've considered.

Lest I forget, let me tell you what else I have in the file. I have Mr. Lashley's letter of February 15th, 2006. I have a typewritten letter from the defendant Alonso which was filed on February 9th, 2006. I have certificates. I also see that he's attended Bible class. And I have certificates about that as well.

And I have another letter from Mr. Lashley dated February 10th, 2006 and attached to that letter are all these certificates about Bible school. I'll let you see that.

I have this letter from Mr. Alonso dated -- that was filed February 6th, 2006. It talks about harsher incarceration and other factors for me to consider in terms of sentencing. It talks about post-offense and rehabilitation. He does seem to have something to say for himself in terms of his turning to the Bible, which is good to see.

And that's basically -- well, I have a letter from Mr. Lashley also of January 9th of 2006 talking about *Booker*,

FanFan.

And that's what I have in the file. So I just don't want to lose track. I also have the sentencing sheet that went along with the sentence -- the plea -- back in April of 2005. I just want to make sure that I have the complete file. Is there anything that's missing?

MR. HOCHBAUM: Not that I'm aware of, Judge.

MS. RYAN: No.

THE COURT: Let's make our calculations, then. Let us see how this gentleman fares.

MR. HOCHBAUM: It's just -- before we go through that, one of the issues that was addressed by Mr. Lashley and my client and myself was his role as manager.

Now, while I understand that somewhat unusually there were allocutions at the time of the plea to sentencing enhancements, my client has consistently maintained that he was not a manager and I think that the facts as set forth in the presentence report do not indicate that he was a manager.

THE COURT: But tell me this, though. Why did he say so during his allocution? Okay? Am I supposed to just ignore what people tell me?

MR. HOCHBAUM: No, Judge. But you are supposed to understand the process here. And the process here was on the eve of trial, everybody is to take a plea and the government's saying the only plea we'll include you're

allocuting about sentence enhancements. See -- you know, we can't divorce ourselves from that process. Now, I'm not suggesting that there's anything wrong with what the government did.

THE COURT: Let's hear this. There's a lot of pressure at the eve of the trial and this defendant did say that he was a manager.

Now, I guess the Court -- you know, looking at the facts, maybe not impose that type of enhancement on him, not withstanding the fact that he said that. Because there is some reality to what Mr. Hochbaum said considering the pressures of the moment and things of that nature, but I'd like to hear from the government.

Did Mr. Alonso really actively involve himself in these criminal activities as a manager in all of that?

MS. RYAN: Yes, he did, Your Honor. And the government's position is that these defendants pled guilty to what they actually did.

THE COURT: There's no question he has that to deal with. But I just want in fairness to the process -- you can explain. I think there's sufficient here for me to feel comfortable, separate and apart from the fact that he allocuted that he, indeed, had managerial responsibilities under the guidelines.

MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor. I tried to address

1.3

that in the letter that we filed yesterday with respect to his managerial role.

This defendant was tasked with various things during his time that he spent working with his co-defendants. Some of those tasks included watching over multiple women at the same time.

He shared an apartment with Josue Flores Carreto and one of his victims and was often left in charge of the women there, was in charge of taking them to and from the brothels where they worked.

THE COURT: But how do we know that? I know he tried. But how do we know that?

MS. RYAN: That's contained in the presentence report, Your Honor, and I tried to cite to that as much as I could in my letter.

We're at a disadvantage here somewhat, Your Honor. We have all these factual disputes going on when we did not, in fact, actually have a trial. I am confident all of this evidence would have come to light at that trial.

MR. HOCHBAUM: The question is, Judge, whether or not the factual evidence -- I mean if we want to say it's from the probation court, that's kind of ridiculous because it's from the government. The Probation Department does not do an independent analysis or an independent investigation. But let's hear what they have to say.

1.3

THE COURT: What if you decided to plead this?

Would you be prepared to go forward if I thought that the hearing would be appropriate to show what his role was? You have people who could testify?

MS. RYAN: I do have people who would testify. I don't know who would be able to go forward right now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No. No. I'm not suggesting you don't, but if Mr. Hochbaum really thinks that his client was just a kind of like a peripheral player here, he wouldn't have accepted 27 counts, that he's not a manager, do you wish to have a hearing on that issue?

MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, I do, but I don't want the Court to misunderstand me. I'm not suggesting my client was a peripheral player.

That's not -- the statute requiring organization or management requires that he organizes or manages five or more participants. So far I've seen that there are four participants in this crime. And the victims are not participants.

THE COURT: And that also includes himself.

MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand that, Judge. Him, the two co-defendants, the manager of the brothel. The victims are not considered participants. All right? So now we have to get into the area of whether or not this was otherwise an

extensive venture. I don't doubt it.

But listen to what they've said. They've said he was directed to go pick people up. He was directed to go stay in the apartment while everybody else went about their business. It's hard to understand how that puts him in a managerial role. Okay?

And I think the Court misunderstands me when I suggested he's not a manager. I'm not suggesting he's peripheral. He's actively involved, but we have to understand the nature of his involvement.

We have a case in which there is an allegation that there are 50 victims. Then with regards specifically to my client, the allegation is one person who gives a statement and that the government has information about five others and then we had a statement by Gloria A. in which she says, essentially, that my client asked her to be a prostitute.

THE COURT: You're very eloquent. I'm not so sure
I agree, but, of course, you may be right, that just by the
fact that somebody's a victim that means that the defendant
was not involved with managing that person's conduct, because
that person was engaged in prostitution.

MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand that but, Judge, the statute is clear. The section is clear. You cannot manage a non-participant. You are not a participant if you're a victim.

165 THE COURT: You know, you talk very rapidly. 1 2 MS. RYAN: Your Honor --3 THE COURT: But that doesn't mean that everything 4 you say I agree with even though I respect you. 5 MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand that. THE COURT: I don't think you're correct. I think 6 7 you can be a person who is involved in criminal behavior even 8 though you've been a victim. That these women were still 9 involved in prostitution and he was involved in you know, 10 that whole process. MS. RYAN: Your Honor? 11 12 THE COURT: Yes. Now, you have something there, 13 Ms. Ryan? 14 MS. RYAN: Yes. If we're going to talk about what 15 it means to be a manager, let's actually talk about the 16 language that's in the guidelines. 17 THE COURT: Right. 18 MS. RYAN: That says, if defendant was a manager or 19 supervisor but not an organizer and the criminal activity 20 involved five or more participants, or was otherwise 21 extensive. 22 The five or more participants we're talking about 23 here -- the defendant was charged in the indictment -- I 24 think there were five or six other people charged in the 25 indictment with him as members of this conspiracy. And I'm

```
1
        confident that I --
 2
                  THE COURT: And we have the person I sentenced?
 3
        The co-defendant I sentenced before, too?
                  MS. RYAN: We have her and she's not named in that
 4
        particular indictment. She's charged in a separate one.
 5
                  THE COURT: And in the indictment, it names all
 6
 7
        these people. He pled to the indictment.
 8
                  MS. RYAN: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.
                  THE COURT: In the indictment, he names more than
 9
        five people.
10
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
11
12
                  THE COURT: Separate and apart from the victims.
1.3
                  MS. RYAN: Yes. I'm talking about criminal
        participants in the charged conspiracy that this defendant
14
15
        pled guilty. They're named in the indictment.
16
                  THE COURT: And he also said --
17
                  MS. RYAN: And there are certainly more than five.
18
                  THE COURT: And he agreed he was the manager?
19
        went carefully with Mr. Lashley in which the defendant --
        that he understood that he was being given proper legal
20
21
        representation? He said yes.
22
                  We went through that so carefully and I can't ask
23
        him in the context of making that inquiry, were you told
24
        specifically about every single thing about being the
```

manager, about being this, about being that. It's not what

```
167
 1
        we do and it's not realistic.
 2
                  We have to accept the fact that he testifies under
 3
        oath, that he was properly advised of his counsel and
        properly advised of his legal rights. And he said that in
 4
        glowing technicolor. I've heard your arguments. Mr.
 5
        Hochbaum, why don't --
 6
 7
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, I'm not looking to repeat my
 8
        arguments.
 9
                  THE COURT: I know. And why don't we do it in the
        context of making our sentencing calculations?
10
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, I thought that's what I was
11
        doing, Judge.
12
1.3
                  THE COURT: But I haven't even gotten to it.
14
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, every sentencing calculation
15
        with regard to this adds three points for a managerial role.
        If you want me to object specifically each time, then I'll do
16
        it that way.
17
18
                  THE COURT: You were listening to me all day. You
19
        know there's some need for structured organization to get
20
        through these types of proceedings.
21
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Absolutely, Judge.
22
                  THE COURT: I don't think you've been involved with
23
        27 counts before, have you?
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I've been involved with 27
24
```

defendants, but that's not to say 27 counts.

1.3

THE COURT: So you could appreciate it takes some effort for the court to organize this. Otherwise, we'll be talking and talking all around the place, right?

So I try to do that by going through Count 1 and the others and giving the lawyers, you've heard, the opportunity to talk about all of these issues about how we made our calculations.

And can you do the same thing with me? You're putting the cart before the horse and it makes it difficult for me to keep a structure. Okay? Very good.

So Count 1 on page 33, Act A, has a base offense level of 27 and as I go through these things, then we can make a final determination with respect to some of these arguments you've already made. Okay?

Then on paragraph 96, we have the use of physical force and threat. Now, look. I don't want to re-visit every aspect of his plea allocution.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Right.

THE COURT: He pled to that.

MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand that.

THE COURT: So that's four points. And then we have the vulnerable victims. And you know the same thing I said about these victims in the first proceeding today with Gerardo and that's incorporated herein and as well. All right? So I'm giving that to the uptake and --

```
169
 1
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Now, we're at a point, Judge --
 2
                  THE COURT: -- then we have the point you made.
                                                                    So
 3
        it's --
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Let the record reflect that I'm
 4
        objecting to the adjustment for the role in the offense under
 5
        Count 1.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: I think that the alternative is I can
        give two levels instead of three if I found that there was
 8
 9
        some issue -- what does the --
10
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: That is correct.
                  THE COURT: -- guideline say specifically about
11
12
        that?
13
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: The guidelines specifically allow
14
        you to do that, Judge.
15
                  THE COURT: Read the --
16
                  MS. RYAN: 3-2-1.1
17
                  THE COURT: Yes. Let me just take a look at that.
18
        I'm glad I got a good night's sleep last night. 3(b)1.1.
19
        The defendant was an organizer, neither a manager or a
        supervisor in any criminal activity other than described in
20
21
        (a) or (b).
22
                  Well, you know, I'm going to give him the benefit
23
                 The government may have a good basis for getting it
24
        reversed, but I think under all of the circumstances and Mr.
25
        Hochbaum's eloquent exposition, that two levels is what I'm
```

170 1 more comfortable with. And so that means he gets an adjusted 2 offense level of 35 and 36. 3 I'm going to keep track of all of this here so we 4 make our proper calculations when we get to the multiple count. 5 Next we have Count 1, Act B. And here we're going 6 7 to have the same 35. Right? 8 MS. RYAN: Yes. 9 MR. HOCHBAUM: That is correct with the same objections noted, Judge. 10 THE COURT: 35. Now Count 1, Act 3 will be once 11 12 again the same 35. 13 MR. HOCHBAUM: Again, Judge, the record is clear. 14 I'm objecting to the --15 THE COURT: Well, you'll have a continuing 16 objection with me giving him two points, right? 17 MR. HOCHBAUM: Right. 18 THE COURT: But if that issue is flushed out on 19 appeal, there will be that the Circuit Court would say that 20 he should have gotten three points, but I'm not going to deal 21 with that right now. 22 MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand. 23 THE COURT: Okay? So that the government would 24 have an argument, I'm thinking, right?

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

171

THE COURT: Count 1, Act D, once again we have 35. Now we come to Act E, Jane Doe number 5 and here we'll have the two-level adjustment for the role and we can eliminate the 16 for the purposes of consistency. And so we will then have 35. Is that correct, also? MS. RYAN: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Another 35. Now Count 1, Act F will have 35. And Act G, once again, 35. Count 1, Act H -let's see what kind of adjustments we are going to make. We're not going to hold him accountable for the scarring and once again, two full adjustment --THE INTERPRETER: I'm sorry. Your Honor, could you repeat what he is not being accountable for? THE COURT: On Act H -- my voice is fading, so I don't mind you telling me to do this. It's been a long day. Act H, we're not going to hold him accountable for the scarring. And of course, once again, two levels instead of

three for adjustment for role in the offense. So that means we're at 35 again. 35 seems to be where we're coming out by and large here.

MS. RYAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Now Count 1, Act I -- it will be 29. Okay? Hear any objections? Count 7 would be I guess 37 there. Am I missing something? Yes. Because you get the two levels for the 2H4.1(b)(4)(B).

172 1 MS. RYAN: Correct. 2 THE COURT: So there's 37. So that's the high 3 water mark so far. Count 8, we're at 37 again. Right? 4 MS. RYAN: Yes. THE COURT: Count 9, once again 37. Right? 5 Count 10, 37. Count 15, Act A is 35. Right? 6 7 MS. RYAN: That is correct. 8 THE COURT: Count 15, Act B will once again be 35. 9 Act C will be once again 35. Act D, 35. And Act E will be 10 adjusted by eliminating the 16-year age one and the adjustment for the response for role is two so that would 11 12 leave 35. Right? Another 35. And Act F will be 35. Act G will be 35. Act H will be 35 because we're eliminating the 1.3 14 permanent scarring in paragraph 225 as well once again of 15 change in the adjustment for role for two points instead of 16 three now. The earlier smuggling ones will carry an adjusted 17 offense level of 19 instead of 20. 18 So there we are and our multiple counts adjustment 19 will reflect all of that and doesn't change the total number 20 of units --21 MR. HOCHBAUM: Right. 22 THE COURT: -- unless I inadvertently make a 23 mistake or I don't think that's affected. Do you agree? 24 MS. RYAN: I agree.

MR. HOCHBAUM: I agree, Judge.

1 THE COURT: The greater of the adjusted offense 2 levels here is thirty --3 MR. HOCHBAUM: Seven, Judge. THE COURT: -- seven and with five added for the 4 multiple counts, we got a 42. Now, that comes out to the 5 6 same as the other defendants' that we made a mistake. If we 7 did not make a mistake, then they would be facing advisory guideline range of life and here it's 360 to life. 8 9 I'll take this into consideration in terms of 10 washing it out under the standards of reasonableness being 11 mindful of the need not to sentence defendants who may not be 12 similarly situated the same. We want to reflect the difference in these different postures of the defendants, so 1.3 14 to speak. So we'll take it under consideration. 15 So now we're not giving acceptance of 16 responsibility and Mr. Hochbaum, what do you say about your 17 client? 18 MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, I'm constrained to remind the 19 court that it's my position that I go last. So I would expect the prosecution to make a statement and if any victims 20 21 are to be called, I would expect them to happen. 22 THE COURT: Well, are there any victims that want 23 to come forward at this time? MS. RYAN: I'll check. 24 25 THE COURT: Do that now and I'll be right back

```
174
 1
        while you do that.
 2
             (Pause.)
 3
                  THE COURT: Yes. Anybody wish to come forward?
 4
                  MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor.
                  THE COURT: Who do we have here?
 5
                  MS. GARCIA: My name is Virginia Garcia.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: All right. And you want to speak to me
        under oath or not under oath? The choice is yours.
 8
 9
                  MS. GARCIA: Under oath.
                  THE COURT: All right. Then the clerk of the court
10
        will administer an oath.
11
12
             (Virginia Garcia is sworn.)
1.3
                  THE COURT: Bear in mind that since you're now
14
        speaking to me under oath and if you don't tell me the truth,
15
        you could be subject to prosecution for perjury or for
16
        rendering a false statement under oath. Okay. Go ahead.
17
        What do you want to say?
18
                  MS. GARCIA: What I want to say is that that man
19
        hurt me very badly and because of him, I abandoned my parents
        and then after that, he put me to work in prostitution and he
20
21
        would say things. He would not allow me to speak to my
        parents when we got here. He would say that they should not
22
23
        find out where I was at. And he would not allow me to send
24
        money to my parents, nothing like that.
25
                  THE COURT: Anything else?
```

```
1
                  MS. GARCIA: Yes. And then later on, when I was
 2
        going to work, he would get extremely angry when I came back
 3
        without any money. That's it.
 4
                  THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Is there anyone
 5
        else, Ms. Ryan?
                  MS. RYAN: Let me check.
 6
 7
             (Pause.)
 8
                  MS. RYAN: No one else, Your Honor.
 9
                  THE COURT: Now let me ask you, Ms. Ryan, a few
        questions before Mr. Hochbaum speaks again. I want to give
10
        him the chance to catch his breath, okay?
11
12
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I don't need that, Judge.
                  THE COURT: This young man is 26 years -- at least
1.3
        -- well, he's more than 26 years. Well, not much more.
14
15
        couple of months.
16
                  But Mr. Hochbaum points out that in terms of the
17
        time span in the conspiracy, he was just 12 years old at the
18
        time that this conspiracy commenced. He pled quilty to it,
19
        but you know, I try to look at the individual circumstances
        of each defendant.
20
21
                  It seems that in his circumstances, personal
22
        circumstances might be different, let alone the difference in
23
        his role than the other two folks that I sentenced today.
24
                  So I might feel the need, you know, not to hang
```

disparate sentencing for those who are similarly situated and

by deductive reasoning, those who were not similarly situated, that should be reflected in the court's sentence.

And given his age and the fact that he could not have done all of these things that the older people were around to do, it seems to strike a responsive chord with the Court when I look that he was just a young fellow when this conspiracy was hatched and he obviously was not part of (indiscernible), I guess. What do you have to say about that?

MS. RYAN: Well, Your Honor, we disagree with the math, but I will say that when he joined this conspiracy, he was a very willing and active participant. And I think that's something the Court needs to consider.

THE COURT: I will. But once again, but he certainly wasn't involved throughout the length of the conspiracy as perhaps the others were.

MS. RYAN: That is perhaps true, but I will point out to the court that the majority of the victims who have spoken in court today and were victims of the conspiracy later than 1991 and you can tell from their own ages which are -- they're younger than this defendant. Even though they were very young when they were being coerced into prostitution. If he was 12 at the time, then these women have not yet been victimized by the defendant.

THE COURT: Okay. I just wanted to flesh that out

1.3

```
especially since Mr. Hochbaum raises the issue. Anything else the defendant wishes to add here?
```

I'm looking at Mr. Alonso in somewhat of a different light because I don't think his role was quite the same as the others. And that's consistent with the fact that he was much younger and more likely to have been taking directions rather than to have been giving directions. I consider that to be a significant difference.

MS. RYAN: We he was certainly taking directions from his co-defendants who were more senior and more experienced at this line of work, but he was coming on --

THE COURT: He was getting up there, right?

MS. RYAN: He certainly was.

THE COURT: He was a potential organizer of meetings?

MS. RYAN: That's our position, Judge. He was living with (indiscernible) and watching him work and working out --

THE COURT: He was learning the trade?

MS. RYAN: He was. And he was not just learning it. This went on for a number of years. The government's information is that he was learning it since 1999.

THE COURT: I understand. But you know, now also, unlike the others, there's a touch of rehabilitation. He does seem to have turned to The Bible. Sometimes these

things may be disingenuous. Sometimes they could be for the purposes of putting him in a favored light. But at least he's made an effort. We have the certificates. The Court's somewhat impressed by that. What does the government say about that circumstance?

MS. RYAN: I know no reason to doubt that the certificates that are issued by these groups that operated in jail are --

THE COURT: They seem to be genuine?

MS. RYAN: And on that, Your Honor --

THE COURT: In a young man, there's some hope for some redemption somewhere down the line if he chose to. In the words of the law, then there's some possibility that maybe if he gets out so he gets a little bit of a life outside of jail, he may have the ability in himself, he could process. Just considering all of the circumstances that might happen.

MS. RYAN: That's certainly the Court's job here.

My job, Your Honor, is to stand and choose -- to let the

society who's offended by the conduct of this defendant and

to stand up and fight for the victims --

THE COURT: That's part of your job and, obviously, we're not treating this matter lightly. I'm sure that you realize that.

Nonetheless, I have an overriding responsibility to

also speak in terms of special calling that the government has to notice it as to what's in the interest of justice and weigh all of these special responsibilities. So that's why I'd like you to interact with me about matters like this and to find out whether there's a legitimacy to and something which the government thinks is worthy of consideration.

MS. RYAN: I'll leave the Court to determine what weight to give this information. Obviously, the seriousness of these crimes are, as the court would point out --

THE COURT: I pointed out those two facts because the seem to represent at least two situations that place a little bit of additional posture on the co-defendants. Well, three actually. That he was not a leader or an organizer. I know we argued about manager. There's age and the fact that he has made an effort to embrace the Scriptures. Anything else, Mr. Hochbaum, I should consider?

THE COURT: Have I articulated these three to your satisfaction?

MR. HOCHBAUM: I have several things to say, yes.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Certainly, Judge. And I think that the most important thing is -- one of the most important things is to note what Ms. Ryan said. That my client's involvement in the conspiracy operated yet in 1999.

We had a conspiracy that went for 13 to 14 years, three-quarters of it, my client was not involved in.

1 THE COURT: But the victims, though, came along 2 later on. 3 MR. HOCHBAUM: Judge, these victims came along 4 later on. Okay? I understand that. 5 THE COURT: There may have been obviously others early on which puts him a different category than the others. 6 7 MR. HOCHBAUM: That is correct, Judge. THE COURT: I think that probably sounds logical. 8 9 MR. HOCHBAUM: In fact, though, I would undertake some exception to the determination that simply because my 10 client was living with one of the Carreto brothers, that that 11 12 meant he was an organizer-in-training. 1.3 I don't think that that necessarily follows. And 14 in fact, while I don't think that it's necessarily wholly 15 appropriate to deal with the victim impact statements, one of 16 the things that occurred to me in looking at the victim impact statement of Gloria A. in the probation report who was 17 18 the -- worked at the billiards parlor where they worked at, 19 indicated that my --20 MS. RYAN: They didn't work at the billiards 21 parlor. 22 MR. HOCHBAUM: No. No. Where they hung out. 23 Excuse me. She worked at the billiard parlor. They hung 24 out. And he, in fact, attempt -- she had been involved in 25 this type of activity before, through someone else. Through

1.3

a completely different organization and my client asked her to work for him.

Now she makes some assumptions about what might have happened if he didn't get arrested, but what is clear, Judge, is that he never exerted the kind of pressure on her. Now maybe because we're in America and she was much older, but he simply asked her a number of times to work in the prostitution business for him. She then makes an assumption that if he hadn't been arrested, other things would have happened.

You know, I don't think that that assumption necessarily follows. And I only bring it up not to denigrate any of the victims in any way. Not to suggest that he wasn't involved in this activity. But when the Court says organizer-in-training because lived with them, it's certainly clear based upon his contact with Gloria A. that he didn't learn the trade the way he should have been learning it.

I don't mean to make light of it, Judge. What I mean to suggest is we've got a situation in which there is a claim that there are more than 50 victims.

THE COURT: Well, I said already that I'm not necessarily accepting that. Because I'm not accepting that.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, I'm willing to accept it,

Judge, for the purposes of argument. But my client,

according to the government and the presentence report, have

one particular victim -- in fact there were two.

He said there were two or three others in Mexico and the government's information is that there were five others that he was involved in. That's what the probation report suggested, and I presume that that information came from the government. I don't imagine that they don't have some other ways of getting that information.

MS. RYAN: Actually, Your Honor, in this case unusually, we did. We had the defendant's own letters that he was writing from the jail where he admitted that he was involved in this kind of activity. He admitted that this was his job and he admitted that he had other women in Mexico who had done this so the proof came from the defendant himself.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, whatever it may be, it's still limited to a much smaller percentage of the victims.

THE COURT: I think you made that point.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Okay.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. HOCHBAUM: The other issue, Judge, and it's a difficult issue for me because of how I want to present myself with regard to other members of the Bar, but it's certainly clear that there were significant problems that occurred between the defendant and Mr. Lashley, his prior counsel.

And one of the most important things that I learned

in reviewing the file here was the significant amount of plea negotiations that went on and I would suggest, on the government's part, seemed to have gone far beyond what would normally be expected. Numerous plea offers were made.

And it seems to me that when we are in the situation that exists now in the Federal courts after *Booker*, we cannot divorce ourselves from the plea bargaining process and simply rely on the artificial guideline calculations.

Now while I know that the government arguments in its letter and that the court should accept the advisory guidelines, it's certainly clear that if my client had pled guilty to a plea agreement in which he was offered 151 months, that the government would not have stood up at that point and said, wait a minute, Judge. That's an unreasonable sentence. He should be getting more.

So while I understand that the government has to take the posture that, you know, plea negotiations go on and once they fall apart, you plead to the indictment and you deal with having plead guilty to 27 counts, it seems to me that the Supreme Court has told us that that formalistic approach should not exist anymore.

That when the court -- and what I include in my letter is the filing that I believe is appropriate -- that when a court sentences a defendant within the guideline range without looking at other factors to make a determination as

to what's a reasonable sentence, it is in fact in violation of *Booker*. Because of *Booker* and 3553(a).

THE COURT: You don't have to argue about it with me, because I don't do that. The fact that I happen to sometimes sentence someone from the advisory guideline range doesn't mean that that's what I feel I have to do.

MR. HOCHBAUM: The plea agreements here, Judge -the government alleged a sentencing range. They made a
promise in the plea agreement and if the defendant had
accepted it, that they would not argue where within the range
he should fall. They would not ask for upward departures.

What we are asking for here in light of what I know about -- what I believe was an ultimate failure in the attorney-client communication, that the court consider a reasonable sentence which would consider the offers made by the government prior hereto.

THE COURT: What do you say about that, Ms. Ryan?

I mean, these are a group of people -- he constantly was unhappy with Mr. Lashley. We know about the history.

Mr. Hochbaum is saying that, you know, you're ready to give this fellow a -- what? 150 months or something like that in your plea negotiations. He was caught up in this situation where there was a global scenario. The others were willing to -- I think the others were willing to plead. He was the one that did not want to plead, if I remember

```
185
 1
        correctly.
 2
                  MS. RYAN: That's my recollection as well, Your
 3
        Honor.
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I don't know about that.
 4
 5
                  THE COURT: I recall that everybody was willing to
        plead and he was the one that was holding it up.
 6
 7
                  MS. RYAN: Yes.
 8
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: That may be, Judge. But I
 9
        understand from special and co-counsel that that role of who
        was unwilling to plead changed at various times.
10
                  THE COURT: I see.
11
12
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: But I do know, however, that at
        various times when in fact substantial negotiating sessions
1.3
14
        went on in MDC, Ms. Obregon was there. Mr. DelValle was
15
        there, representing the other co-defendants. Mr. Lashley was
16
        not. Okay? Now, it may be that because my client felt he
        was not getting individualized attention and individualized
17
18
        advice that he felt, I'm the one to say, I can't plead here
19
        because I'm not getting anything.
20
                  THE COURT: No. But I think realistically, they
21
        all spoke to each other. Their lawyers spoke to each other.
22
        I mean, I can't be part of plea negotiations.
23
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I understand that.
24
                  THE COURT: If I was a state judge, I could, but
```

there's a real distinction in that respect between the

25

Federal system and the State system.

1.3

But I do recall that the others were willing to plead. I don't know exactly what the plea deal was since I'm not involved in that level and that he, you know, was holding it up.

I remember Mr. DelValle talking to me about this. Mr. Musa-Obregon talking about it. It wasn't as if he was out of the loop because they were all together here with and/or without Mr. Lashley. And I also remember on the eve of trial when Mr. Lashley was talking about going down to Florida, I said no. You've got to be here while these plea negotiations are unfolding.

And I made him stay here. So he was really part of that process and I was on top of it also and your client, I think, to my recollection had a large part to play in the fact that this plea did not come to fruition.

Now, you can tell me if I'm wrong, Ms. Ryan.

MS. RYAN: That was my recollection as well, Your Honor. And I could be saying --

THE COURT: They were all exasperated about that.

MS. RYAN: They were. I'd like to also just go back again, Your Honor, to the hearing colloquy that was conducted during negotiation pleas.

Not only did the Court refer back to this problem with counsel creating distance in the cap and the defendant

knowingly and intelligently waived problems in the cap there.

There was also the standard colloquy that the Court conducted with respect to what other promises may have been made to this defendant prior to this plea and basically making sure that no promises were, in fact, made.

THE COURT: We went over that very carefully also.

MR. HOCHBAUM: And I looked in the transcript and it was a masterable job in that regard.

THE COURT: We have a mutual admiration society.

MR. HOCHBAUM: I still think that the import of the plea negotiations are that at some point everybody involved in this case, excepting me, was prepared to say that sentences and plea negotiations which ranged from 150 up to 188 months, went from 165 and I think at some point, everybody was prepared to say they were reasonable.

I'm simply asking this Court to take that into consideration on fashioning a reasonable sentence here. So let's divorce ourselves on who decided not to take the plea, why pleas were offered and not. It seems to me that that's a factor that the court should consider what is an appropriate sentence.

THE COURT: Yes. But you know, I --

MR. HOCHBAUM: I just want to cut it short, Judge, and say that my final analysis is in light of what has gone on here today and in light of the distinction between my

client and the Carreto brothers, difference in age, difference of the years that he was involved in the conspiracy, the difference in his role, that the court should consider a sentence of 20 years as a reasonable sentence.

I don't believe my client would be happy -- or is happy that I'm suggesting that. But it seems to be appropriate in light of what's happened today and what we've heard for me to give at least the court some unofficial -- I don't know whether it's --

THE COURT: No. That's okay.

MR. HOCHBAUM: -- guidance as to where I deem an appropriate sentence is in light of all the distinctions that we made here.

THE COURT: Very good. Let me hear the government quickly and then we'll speak to Mr. Alonso.

MS. RYAN: Yes, Your Honor. I'd just like to make one point in response to Mr. Hochbaum's point about prior plea offers I think that were made by the government and what those ranges were and at that point, everyone thought they were reasonable.

I'm sure the court can understand why months in advance of trial, the government's view of what would be a reasonable sentence particularly to a -- I believe that most of these standard agreements were substantially less than 27 counts of the conviction.

I can't remember now if it was one count or if it was four counts or if it depends on how many victims the defendants in question were personally responsible for, but that certainly would also be something the Court should consider when thinking back to a prior range that was offered in advance of trial that would save the government the time and expense of a trial and would save the victims the trauma of having to testify at the trial. That would be to the Court what would be reasonable --

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. I gave very harsh sentences to the other defendants, but -- and I don't have any factual record as to what those prior plea offers kept.

Because my sense is that under Rule 11, I'm not privy to that.

MS. RYAN: That's right, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, could it be argued, however, on some sort of a collateral basis that since the government's willing to offer these global pleas and in sentencing, it was offering to significantly less than what the court sentenced that my sentence would not be reasonable, and does that have any legal legs to it, in your opinion?

MS. RYAN: No, Judge. I think that the court's reasons for the sentences that were given previously -- all those facts under 3553 -- that the court was very aptly and correctly identified --

```
1
                  THE COURT: So it's your view of the law that the
 2
        court cannot take into consideration in deciding what's
 3
        reasonable any plea offers that the government may have made?
 4
                  MS. RYAN: I've been thinking about this since I
        received Mr. Hochbaum's letter. I think it is a very
 5
        creative argument --
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: And that's why I'm raising the issue.
                  MS. RYAN: I understand, Your Honor. And I think
 8
 9
        that he's --
                  THE COURT: Is it a circumstance under 3553(a),
10
        etcetera for the court to consider -- I don't think there's
11
12
        any law on that at all.
                  MS. RYAN: I don't expect that there is. I think
1.3
        that Mr. Hochbaum was careful in crafting his argument to try
14
15
        to avoid the (indiscernible). I'm not sure if he's
16
        succeeded.
17
                  THE COURT: Yes. I don't know whether I can take
18
        it into consideration as a factor. Under Rule 11, I'm not
19
        allowed to participate and have knowledge of prior plea
20
        negotiation.
21
                  I just raise this because, you know, it was August
22
        when we trotted out the other defendants before the Circuit
23
        Court but Mr. Hochbaum raises it -- it's interesting to
24
        engage in conversation about it.
```

All right. Anything else that you wish to say, Ms.

25

Ryan? Okay.

1.3

MS. RYAN: Your Honor. I just -- again. That the 3553 factors here in this case weigh heavily of I think what would be a reasonable sentence in view of the guidelines.

THE COURT: Okay. We have your position. Let me hear from Mr. Alonso. You can speak to the Court now.

(Pause.)

MS. RYAN: Your Honor, I'm sorry. Before the defendant speaks, I just noticed I may not have marked it down and I don't know whether the court required us to or whether Mr. Hochbaum --

MR. HOCHBAUM: I made the objection.

THE COURT: (Indiscernible) because it's so easy to slip up, you know, on a whole day's proceeding. Need I be concerned about the fact that you went over this very carefully? Obviously, you did from your comments.

MR. HOCHBAUM: Yes, I did, Judge and in fact, Mr. Lashley did as can be seen by the nature of the objections that he filed prior to my being on this case.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: I'm satisfied -- I should be satisfied whether you had ample opportunity to review everything with Mr. Alonso. You used a Spanish interpreter to communicate with him as well?

MR. HOCHBAUM: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: -- and you're satisfied that he understands its contents?

MR. HOCHBAUM: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you for pointing that out. Do you wish to speak to me, Mr. Alonso, before sentence is imposed? You have the right to do so. You do not have to do so, but it is your prerogative.

DEFENDANT ALONSO: What I want to say, Your Honor, is that Mr. Lashley didn't give me the proper advice. I have here a piece of paper that mentions some of my rights which Mr. Lashley never did.

THE COURT: You see, the problem, Mr. Alonso, is that that's not what you told the Court. That I painstakingly flushed all of that out because I'm getting smart in my old age.

And I know that there are going to be proceedings after today's sentence. And in reference to them, you may recall when we took your plea to what we call Section 2255 and you raised ineffective assistance of counsel.

We get those applications very frequently and I was trying to nip that in the bud. That in taking extraordinary efforts to make sure that Mr. Lashley and you were in sync, that you were satisfied with his representation.

I'm not going to repeat what I already pointed out to you before. I gave you ample opportunity to say no. But you said that you're satisfied. I could not do more that.

For you to come before me now and tell me you have a list of grievances against Mr. Lashley is not becoming of you, considering the efforts I made back in April of 2005 to cover all of that.

And you may recall how careful I was in making sure that you had proper counsel and how I spoke with Mr. Lashley and how I made efforts to safeguard your rights.

But for you to come now, tell me you're not satisfied with what I did and what Mr. Lashley did, doesn't speak well for you in my humble opinion.

But if you want to persist in not taking responsibility here, you know, you can say whatever you choose, but I just want to caution you that it doesn't speak well for you.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: Anything else you wish to say, Mr.

Alonso? You could say things -- you don't have to -- like -
I'll try my Spanish here. Lo siento. That's one

possibility. I'm not saying you have to say that, but you could say those types of things.

THE INTERPRETER: I will now interpret the phrase that the defendant uttered before.

```
1
                  DEFENDANT ALONSO: I have many things to say.
 2
        Amongst the things that I have to say is that there are
 3
        victims and I am sorry. I am very sorry for it.
 4
                  I ask for your forgiveness.
                  THE INTERPRETER: Interpreter's correction.
 5
                  DEFENDANT ALONSO: I ask for your mercy. And
 6
 7
        that's it.
 8
                  THE COURT: All right. You seem to be somewhat
 9
        contrite. Of the three defendants here, you seem to be the
10
        most contrite.
                  And as I indicated before, I put you in a different
11
12
        category because you're a young person and to some extent
        when you were 12 years old, you got involved in this
13
14
        activity. Is that how old he was at the time?
15
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: Well, the age -- the conspiracy he's
16
        charged with --
17
                  THE COURT: Right. But he was older when he got
18
        involved.
19
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: -- when he was 12. He didn't get
20
        involved until he was 17 or 18.
21
                  MS. RYAN: I think that's right, Judge.
22
                  THE COURT: He's still a young person. You know,
23
        to some extent, considering that he was 17 or 18 when he got
24
        involved which would put him in a different category, makes
25
        him a little bit more susceptible to being part of the gang.
```

1.3

MS. RYAN: That may be true, Your Honor. I will say that I think the other defendants started when they were quite young as well and just continued longer into their adulthood.

THE COURT: It's true. They were older when -- I think one was 33. The other was 40. All right. There's somewhat of a nature for correction.

But I also, as I mentioned before, considering the fact that he was not an organizer -- that he would become one in the future. I'm not going to speculate. So his role was different.

And I'm also impressed by how he's conducted himself while he's been incarcerated and I have these certificates of Bible study. They are legitimate. This is different than the other fellows.

He seems to have some recognition of this was not the type of life he should be leading in the future, so I think that there are significant differences when I consider his personal circumstances.

Now, of course, the seriousness of the offenses remain because he pled to all 27 of them. There's no difference in that respect and of course the need for deterrence is paramount and protecting the public from any further crimes of the defendants, but he's going to have a considerable amount of time to continue his Bible studies in

school and in jail and hopefully the public will be protected when he gets out of jail. And he'll still be a relatively young man.

I find that a reasonable sentence in respect to Counts 2 through 6 is 25 years. Now that's concurrent. There'll be five years of supervised release with a special condition that he be deported. He may not re-enter the United States illegally.

On Counts 1 and 7 through 27, the sentence is five years each. And all of that will be concurrent to each other and to the other sentence is there's a \$2,750 special assessment.

If he doesn't have the ability to pay a fine, there are general conditions of supervised release that can be made to the court.

Just hand it to the defendant. They're in Spanish. They have to be read by him.

He has the right to appeal. If he cannot afford counsel, he can ask for counsel to be appointed by reason of indigency. And Mr. Hochbaum will make sure that his current rights are protected. That has to be done by filing a notice of appeal within ten days after judgment -- written judgment is entered. And perfect it within 30 days thereafter unless he gets an extension of time from the Court of Appeals to perfect the appeal.

```
I think that's covered for on the basis it's ten
 1
 2
        after 6:00. Is there anything I may have inadvertently left
 3
        out?
                  The sentence I've given is below the advisory
 4
        range. So I took in that consideration as well as all of the
 5
        factors set forth in 3553(a) and then Mr. Hochbaum, as I
 6
 7
        would expect, rendered valuable assistance to his client.
 8
                  Anything else?
 9
                  MS. RYAN: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
                  THE COURT: I'm not going to deal with the
10
        restitution issue again.
11
12
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: That's fine.
1.3
                  THE COURT: I expect that I'm not going to have to
14
        come back again for another sitting here, but once again, I
15
        don't want to preclude the gentleman from exercising his
16
        legal entitlements. That concludes the sentence today.
17
                  MR. HOCHBAUM: I just want to say that on behalf of
18
        my client, I would like to thank for its reasonable
19
        consideration here. And that I will on receipt of the
20
        judgement, file a notice of appeal on his behalf.
21
                  THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
22
                  MS. RYAN: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
23
                  THE COURT: Thank you.
24
             (Proceedings concluded at 6:05 p.m.)
25
             I, CHRISTINE FIORE, court-approved transcriber, certify
```

	198
1	that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official
2	electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-
3	entitled matter.
4	
5	Christine Liere
6	Churcust Tibre
7	May 1, 2006
8	Christine Fiore
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	